



UNIVERSITY OF
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES



Richard L. Derry

THE LIBRARY CHRONICLE

Vol. XLV 1981 Nos. 1-2



Friends of the Library

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
PHILADELPHIA

1981

THE LIBRARY CHRONICLE



Rittenhouse Orrery

Friends of the Library
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

2
723

PHIL

1.45, 1981

3

CONTENTS

VOLUME XLV · 1981 · NUMBERS 1-2

Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Libraries of the University of Pennsylvania to 1800: Supplement B RUDOLF HIRSCH	5
Giuntini's Correspondence with "Il Dubbioso Accademico" and Observations on Editorial Principles of the Renaissance in Italy and France ROBERT C. MELZI	30
Bibliography of M. A. Shaaber MARGARET L. SHAABER and WILLIAM E. MILLER	44
Elizabeth Grymeston's <i>Miscellanea. Meditations. Memoratives</i> : Introduction and Selected Text B. Y. FLETCHER and C. W. SIZEMORE	53
<i>Hamlet</i> : an Italian Source? A. P. STABLER	84
William Musgrave and John Reynolds's <i>Mela</i> J. D. ALSOP	89
Revisions in the Published Texts of Volume One of Samuel Richardson's <i>Clarissa</i> WILLIAM B. WARDE, JR.	92

Published semiannually by the Friends of the University of Pennsylvania Library.
Subscription rate, \$10.00 for non-members. § Articles and notes of bibliographic and
bibliophile interest are invited. Contributions should be submitted to William E.
Miller, Editor, *The Library Chronicle*, University of Pennsylvania Library, Philadelphia,
Pennsylvania 19104.

Friends and Foes: Noah Webster's Involvement in Personal Politics in Eighteenth-Century American Periodical Publishing	104
THOMAS H. BROWN	
The Childhood of Morley Roberts	115
THEOPHILUS E. M. BOLL	
Lenore versus Pallas Athene: a Reading of Poe's "The Raven"	129
MARY HALLAB and CHRISTOPHER NASSAAR	
"The Mask of the Red Death" and Poe's Reading of Hawthorne	143
CHARLES N. WATSON, JR.	
William Carlos Williams's <i>Paterson</i> : a Search for Language, a Recovery of Words	150
JAMES DEMUTH	

Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Libraries of the University of Pennsylvania to 1800

SUPPLEMENT B

THE brevity of Supplement B, describing eighty-one items, hardly needs a prefatory statement; the description of manuscripts follows the style of Supplement A. Nor does it need an apology. It is not likely that other manuscripts remain hidden in obscure places or uncatalogued; and the receipt of manuscripts, whether by purchase or gift, has greatly diminished. Increasing prices, fewer opportunities, and lack of funds are obvious reasons.

The compiler of this and the previous Supplement is tempted to add a personal note. The manuscript collection of the University of Pennsylvania is not spectacular, but it has proven itself to be useful in research and teaching. He hopes that the collection will not stagnate, a fate that has befallen so many collections here and abroad. Owners of manuscripts are cordially invited to contribute from their collections; Friends of the Library and other benefactors are also invited to contribute to the Friends' fund so that further acquisitions might be made on occasion, as interesting items come on the market.

[Editor's Note: Supplement A is to be found in *The Library Chronicle*, xxxv:3-32; xxxvi:3-36, 79-104; and xxxvii:3-23, 91-115 (corrigenda and index, xxxviii:99-122).]

RUDOLF HIRSCH*

LAT. 260.

JOHANNES FREDERICUS GRONOVIUS. *Ortus et occasus veterum regum ac regnorum.* Partly a commentary on Justinus, copied after the author's death (1671) by Cornelius ab Overmeer (cf. p.248). *Netherlands, 1713.*

Paper. 1 f., 248 pp. 15.5 × 9.5 cm. Contemp. gilt calf (the ornament on front cover repeated in black on f.1r). Later bookplate BVH inside front cover. — Gronovius was professor of history, rhetoric and Greek in Leyden.

*Emeritus Professor of History, and former Associate Director of Libraries, University of Pennsylvania.

LAT. 261.

[ARISTOTLE]. Annotata in libellos Aristotelis, Parva naturalia appellatos; divided as follows: 1. De sensu et sensili, ff.3r-49r. - 2. De memoria et recordatione, ff.56r-73v. - 3. De somno et vigilia, ff.75r-91r. - 4a. De insomniis, ff.92r-103v; b. De divinatione ex insomniis, ff.104r-115v. - 5. De motu animalium, ff.117r-142r. - 6. De longa et brevi vita, ff.143r-153v. - 7a. De juventate et senectute, vita et morte, ff.154r-164v. b. De respiratione, ff.164v-199v. *Germany, 1584-85.*

Paper. 200 ff. (ff.2, 50-55, 74, 116 and 200 blank; 3 ff. with traces of writing removed between ff.103-104, without loss of text). 21 × 16.5 cm. Contemp. vellum. - Lecture notes in two hands, indicating in many cases the day of the lecture (e.g., ff.49r, 56v, 63r), but without naming the place or institution; name on f.1r made unreadable (Hubertus Jacobus D... a...?). The inclusion of reformers among quoted authorities (e.g., Melanchthon) makes it likely that the lectures were delivered in Lutheran territory.

LAT. 262.

OESEL (Ozilia-Saare), diocese. Confirmation by Pope Clement VII of Remoldus as bishop of Oesel, with all the rights inherent, incl. dealing with "rebelles" (Protestants), with names of witnesses and signed Jo. de Capasso. *Rome, 1532.*

Paper. 1 f. Oblong, ca. 28.5 × 17 cm. Matted. - Removed 1972 from Flacius Illyricus, *Eccl. historia*, Basel, 1560 (246.F592). Entered on left margin in a later dissenter's hand: Clemens inferni dei providentia episcopus Romanus cerberus cerberorum diaboli suis membris antichristianis salutem apostolicam benedictionem. In the same hand on verso: Unum breve conformativum episcopale. Diabolicense volebam dicere apostolicum.

LAT. 263.

JACOBUS JOSEPHUS DARTIGUELONGUE. Phisica scripta sub admodum R. P. Cambos, philosophiac professore, doctore aggregato in Collegio Squillano tolosano anno domini 1751... (title within engraved t.-p., signed A Toulouse, chez Baour). La phisyqye [!] (engr. illustrated second title). Codex de philosophia generali... ad usum Dartiguelongue narbonensis philosophiae candidati et convictoris in eodem collegio (third title). - Pars 2^a philosophiae seu phisica (numb. f.1r)=Prima pars phisicæ generalis (f.105r). *Toulouse, 1751.*

Paper. 6, 105 numb., 10 unnumb. ff. (first 3 and last 8 ff. blank). 17.5 × 11 cm. Engraved portraits of N. Malebranche, Aristotle, R. Descartes and P. Gassendi, and 4 plates from unidentified book(s) inserted; few diagr. in text. Contemp. calf. - Inscr. Paris Blaisot & Cie. 1880 on f.1r and stamp "Société française de physique, Bibliothèque" in several places.

LAT. 264.

GUIMBERTEAU (canon of Blancy, in the diocese of Angoulême). Philosophiac codex. Prolegomena (pp.1-31); Logica (pp.31-32, ff.1-55); Methaphisica (ff.56-161); Ethica seu moralis (ff.162-240), preside D. illustrissimo Leloup, discipulo Guimberteau. *France, 18th cent.*

Paper. 1 f., 32 pp., 240 ff. (some ff. at end, probably blank, removed). 21 × 16 cm. Contemp. vellum. – From the statement on p.29, “Carthesii methodus optima est ad perfecte philosophandum,” it is assumed that the otherwise not further identified teacher Leloup was a disciple of Descartes. Gift of Dr. George Boas.

LAT. 265.

NICOLAUS APPEL (or Apel). *Confutatio libelli Philippi Melanchtonis cuius titulus est De officio principum, quod mandatum dei praecipiat eis tollere abusus ecclesiasticos, authore D. Nicolao Appel anno domini 1540.* Ad reverendum patrem ac illustrissimum principem Dominum D. Philippum, episcopum Fresingense, comitem palatinum. . . . *Mostburg* (f.3r), 1540.

Paper. 32 ff. (last f. blank, partly removed; f.1r with notation *Philipica quinta . . .* [some words erased and made unreadable] Jo. Coclei. Nicolai Appel contra Melanchtonem; presumably a reference to the printed item following the *Confutatio*). 21 × 15 cm. Contemp. blindpressed pigskin, with early ownership entries Joannes Salzberg (inside front cover), Stephan Rosinus; Societas Jesu, Oetingen on title page of first item in this volume. – The *Confutatio* is not mentioned in Wetzer and Welte (v.I, cols.1001-1006) nor listed in Schottenloher. Unpublished and autograph? Shelved as GC5.C6427.54od.

LAT. 266.

CLAUDE MANCLER. 1. *Quarta pars coenae philosophicae seu physicae [Aristotelis], in tres libros de anima et alios de viventibus, a R. P. Claudio Maneler, Soc. Jesu. Angelinus Brun auditor philosophiae, hac scribenda curavit anno 1635, ff.1-201.* – 2. *Convivii philosophici mensae secundae, ff.205-37.* – 3. *Convivii philosophici poculum boni genii, seu pars postrema metaphysica et theologica naturalis, ff.242-339.* *Avignon, 1634-36.*

Paper. 3, 345 ff. (2 prel. ff., ff.202-4, 238-41 and 340-5 blank); parts are sep. numbered 1-201, 1-33, and 1-98. 19.5 × 13.5 cm. Contemp. sheepskin. – A. Backer and C. Sommervogel, *Bibl. des écrivains de la Comp. de Jésus*, v.V, p.747, state that Mancler taught at that time in Aix, but the *explicit* on 339v places him at Avignon: Finis totius philosophiae datae Avenionii a R. P. Claudio Maneler, Soc. Jesu. ab 18º gbris anni 1634 usque ad 28º Augusti anni 1636 et à me Angelino Brun philosophiae auditore accepta. . . .

LAT. 267.

DISTINCTIO ASTRONOMIAE ET ASTROLOGIAE, *inc.*: Vetus

universam doctrinam coeli et syderum promiscuo nomine. . . . *Germany, third quarter 16th cent.*

Paper. 50 ff. (ff.1-2 blank). 15.5 x 10 cm. Bds. Bound following three astronomical textbooks, incl. Sacrobusco's *Libellus de sphaera*, printed 1549-1553. - Shelved as GC5.Sp236.539c.1553.

LAT. 268.

GEORG FABRICIUS. 1. *De omnibus in tragœdiis Senecæ carminum generibus . . .*, with dedication "Illustris Ducis ac Domini D. Wolfgangi . . . Ducis Bavariae, comitis Veldentii filii, D. D. Othoni Henrico et Friderico fratribus," dated 1565 (ff.2r-8r). - 2. *De reliquis carminum generibus [and] In Senecæ tragœdiis lectionis diversitas* (ff.16r-66r), with dedication "Viro claro Henrico Paxmano, doctori medico." *Germany, ca. 1589.*

Paper. 66 ff. and several blank ff. 17 x 11 cm. Contemp. stamped pigskin. Prov.: Christian Brockmayer, 1660; Nicolaus Salomon Troltz (?), 1702; Leutsch Library. - (1) begins with short extracts from biographies of Seneca (Petrus Crinitus and Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus) and Avantinus Veronensis' *De carmine iambico trimetro* (ff.8r-15v). - Bound and shelved with Seneca's *Tragoediae . . .*, Heidelberg, 1589. Two MSS folios "De periochis" bound in between ff.2-3.

LAT. 269.

ANTONIUS CAMPEGGIUS. *Privilegium legitimationis, habilitationis, et dispensationis*, for Clemens Paulus, son of Caesar Philippi de Hinis, notarized by Julius Gaspari de Vitalibus. *Bologna, 1612.*

Vellum. 6 ff. 22.5 x 13 cm. With notarial signet. Contemp. vellum. - Bound with *Transumptum privilegiorum, concessionum, immunitatum, et indultorum, auctoritate apostolica, et imperiali concessorum . . . comitibus de Campegiis, nobilibus Bonon., Bologna, J. Rossi, 1587*. The printed item was probably appended to substantiate the authority of Antonius Campeggius (or Campegius).

LAT. 270.

NAPLES, Consilio Regio. *Originalis processus cause approximo vertentis . . . inter magnificum Peritheum de Malvitiis [Malvizzi] utiliter dominum terrarum Tarante et quatorum et Jacobum de Assayante et alios . . . appellantes ex una parte, et reverendum episcopum Valvensem [et Sulmonensem, i.e., Joannes Acuti] . . . ex . . . parte altera*. Dispute over land of the abbey Santa Maria de Lecto, before Carolus de Rogeris of Salerno in the name of King Ferdinand, and Maximus Ruta, actorum magister. Consists of 12 parts (several with seals and some with signatures), covering the entire proceedings from June 30 to Oct. 15, 1500. - *With: IDEM.*

Supplicatio pro Angelillo Thomasii Pranti et Alife [?] Processus de reintegratione feudorum, 1499-1500, under supervision of Joannes Christophorus de Transimundi; separately paged. *Naples, 1499-1500.*

Paper. 36 ff. (ff.34-6 blank), and ff.2-44 (last ff. damaged with loss of some text). 29 × 21.5 cm. Bds. with vellum spine and label entitled "Processi contra il vescovo di Valva del 1500." Guilford Collection; Phillips MS.5450. - Purchased on Lessing and Edith Rosenwald Fund.

LAT. 271.

HEILIGENSTADT, Collegium Societatis Jesu. Catalogus secundus Bibliothecae . . . continens libros . . . corumque auctores secundum alphabeticum nominum auctorum numerum. *Heiligenstadt, 1720.*

Paper. 2 blank ff., 368 pp., 20 blank ff. 32.5 × 20 cm. Contemp. pigskin, with clasps. Prov.: Staatsgymnasium Heiligenstadt. Lists an estimated 3500-4000 volumes.

LAT. 272.

HORAE de Sancta Katherina, *inc.*: Deprecare regem celi. . . . *Germany, early 15th cent.*

Vellum. 28 ff. (incomplete at end, where prayers to St. Barbara and a Passio are added in a different hand). 12 × 9 cm. Illuminated initials. Morocco. Prov.: Ernest F. Salmon, 1892; E. B. Krumbhaar, 1910. - Same as De Ricci, II, 1993, no.1.

LAT. 273.

MICHAEL ANGELUS RUSSO. Commentarii in universam Aristotelis Physicam, sub ductu auspiciisque D. Iosephi Bonicori anno etatis XVII, et III menses (cf. f.95r, end of Liber II). *Italy, 17th cent.*

Paper. 286 ff. (ff.240-2 and 285-6 blank). 21 × 15 cm. Calligraphic initials, illus. and schematic drawings. Contemp. vellum. - Partial contents (to f.60 only) at end of volume.

LAT. 274.

STEPHANUS GUEVETANUS. Brevis de metcoris [Aristotelis] tractatus, ff.2r-61r, *inc.* (text, f.4r): Ad libros de generatione . . . adiungimus brevem tractatum de meteoris. - *With:* JACOBUS LABUS. Questiones in tres libros de anima Aristotelis, ff.67r-125v, *inc.*: Tres libri de anima vel considerantur. . . . *Pisa, 1670-1671.*

Paper. 130 ff. (first and last ff. pasted inside front cover; ff.3, 62-66, 126-130 blank). 19.5 × 14 cm. Contemp. vellum. "Ex libris Francisci Tenuti Corbonensis," inside cover; ". . . in Atheneo Metaphysics lectore ordinario in eius sede

[i.e., Jacobi Labi] subrogato, mihi Francisco Tenuti Corbonensi Pisis humanissime tradita, atque doctissime elucidata Anno 1670 et 1671," on first leaf. — Guevetanus and Labus not recorded in J. Quétif and J. Échard, *Script. Ord. Praed.*

LAT. 275.

[ARISTOTLE]. Philosophicae disquisitiones secundum Aristotelis mentem, *inc.* (Prolegomenon): Cum ingenita et innata . . . sit sciendi cupiditas . . . , pp.1-62. — *With:* THOMAS de PHILIPPIS. Diversae chirurgicae institutiones, ff.1-87 (second numbering). *Naples, 1752.*

Paper. 62 pp.; 5 blank, 87, 6 blank ff. (129 ff.) 20 × 14.5 cm. Contemp. vellum. — Lecture notes written by Domenico Bonelli (f.87r). Incomplete?, cf. blind catchword on f.86v.

LAT. 276.

MEDITATIONES in duodecim primos Psalmos Davidis prophetę in honorem 12 apostolorum, *inc.:* Amantissime dominus deus, unica spes animę meę. . . . *Flanders, ca. 1600.*

Paper. 68 ff. 13 × 10 cm. 12 engravings by Adrian Collaert; one figured and several smaller illuminated initials of the late 14th or early 15th cent. pasted in. Contemp. vellum. Prov.: E. B. Kruimhaar. — Same as De Ricci, II, 1993, no.2.

LAT. 277.

BREVIARY [use of Langres?]. *Southern France, 14th cent.*

Vellum. 205 ff. (imperfect; misbound). 11 × 8 cm. Calf. Prov.: J. E. Schulte; Anderson Sale, New York, May 12, 1910; E. B. Kruimhaar. Same as De Ricci, II, 1993, no.3 — The manuscript was originally numbered in two series, one for the Temporale, the other for the Sanctorale. Ff.1-6 and 178-93 are not foliated; they contain portions of the Psalms and the Canticles.

LAT. 278.

HORAE [ad usum Sarum?]. *France, 2nd half 15th cent.*

Vellum. 10 ff. (fragment; misbound). 20 × 14 cm. Illuminated initials. Red morocco. Prov.: E. B. Kruimhaar. Same as De Ricci, II, 1993, no.4.

LAT. 279.

[ARISTOTLE]. Dialectica elementalis, seu prima dialecticae elementa, *inc.* (Proemium): Praicit auditores Dialectica . . . (Text): Cum eo logica collimet. . . . Tractatus primus-quartus, ff.1-221v; tractatus quintus, De antepraedicamentis . . . sub reverendissimo patre Martino de Regadera, ff.222r-223v; tractatus sextus, De praedicamentis, ff.223v-231r; tractatus septimus, In duos libros Perihermenias, sive De interpretatione [Aristo-

telis], ff.231v-241v; tractatus octavus, In libros analyticos Aristotelis . . . , ff.242r-246v. (This part ends with "Finem posuimus 18^o die Junii Anno Do[mi]ni 1686 . . . , Logicae vniuersae finis. . . .") – *With: Disputationes in secundum philosophiac partem neinpe phisicam sive philosophiam naturalem*, ff.248r-302v. *Spain?*, 1685?-1686.

Paper. Irregular pagination; 302 ff. (incl. a few blank pp. and ff.) 20 × 14.5 cm. Pen-and-ink vignettes, illus. Cloth. – The name of St. [Francis] Xavier in the decorative pattern of several caption titles, and the appearance and character of the text suggest that these are lecture notes taken at a Jesuit college. Martinus de Regadera (f.222r) is not listed in Backer and Sommervogel. See also "Sortes Regadera" on illus. of f.224v. – Gift of W. R. Newbold.

ENG. 38.

SAFFIN-ELLIS Miscellany. Collection of cooking recipes, preparations for making drinks and preserves, pharmaceutical prescriptions of a great variety, many of them giving the names of doctors (e.g., Drs. Hartley, Crine, Russell, Dover, etc., also one by Boerhaave), and a few extraneous matters (like the good and harmful effects of tobacco (f.169v) or the production of oil paint (f.178r)), many of these in an early hand when the volume belonged to a Betty Saffin (cf. "Bettee Saffin Her Book 1716" on the title page), but blank pages and the latter part in a hand or hands belonging to the period of a second owner (cf. "Ann Ellis Her Book . . . 1762"). It is in the second section that extraneous texts were entered or laid in: 1. Inventory of silver (loose prel. f.1). – 2. Copy from the *London Gazette*, August 11, 1757 on military losses in the battle of the Weser (f.9v). – 3. Account of Sir George Rook's taking of the French fleet, 1702-5 (ff.10v, 11v, 12v). – Articles of capitulation between Rook and the Governor of Gibraltar (f.13v). – Rook's account of the sea engagement near Malaga (f.14v). – 6. William Smith. A charge delivered May 17, 1757 at the first anniversary commencement in the College and Academy of Philadelphia (ff.30r-34v). *England (etc.?)*, ca. 1716-1762. Written in several hands.

Paper. 2 prel. ff., title, ff.1-50 (ff.51-84 missing), ff.85-96 (with insert between ff.93-4; ff.97-128 and 130 missing), ff.129, 131-9 (ff.140-56 missing), ff.157-78 (inserts between ff.157-8; f.179 missing or omitted in numbering), ff.180-5 (ff.182-5 loose; a few ff. and several pp. are blank). 32 × 20.5 cm. Contemp. calf (in bad condition). – No. 6 (the address of Provost Smith) differs substantially in spelling and slightly in the text from the printed version. – Gift of Richard W. Foster.

ENG. 39.

JOHN SHORE TEIGNMOUTH (Governor General of India). Letters to Henry Dundas (president of the Board of Control), and copies made by Dundas of documents sent by J. S. Teignmouth concerning Indian affairs. *India, January 10, 1793 – October 17, 1798.*

Paper. 308 pp. and unnumbered appendix of ca. 600 pp. 31 x 19.5 cm. Contemp. calf with leather label on spine: Governor General Sir John Shore, and dates. – Gift of Holden Furber, who edited the correspondence in *The Private Record of an Indian Governor-Generalship* (Cambridge, Mass.), 1933.

FR. 142.

PIXERÉCOURT (Lorraine). Collection of 12 documents relating to the seigniory: 1. État des cens (1582). 2. Déclaration des vignes, terres et preys . . . appartenants cy devant à Dame veuve du Sr. de Lescut (1588, 1593). 3. [Déclaration] des preys, qui doivent cens aux Srs. de Malzéville (1587). 4. [Déclaration] des rentes (1593). 5. [Déclaration des terres et preys] faisant pied terrier faite à la réquête des Sr. Bermant et De. veuve du Sr. de Fligny (1643). 6. Autre pied terrier (1648). 7. (See below.) 8. Compte de recette des cens (1739). 9. [Compte] des cens dus à M. Alix (1740). 10. Cahier contenant les acquets . . . avec un discours contenant l'origine de Pixerécourt (1736–37). 11. Inventaire des ascensements [1736–37]. 12. Mémoire pour connoître quant et comment la signeurie de Pixerécourt est obtenu au Sr. Jean de Lescut [1595]. *Lorraine, 1582–1740.*

Paper. 140 ff. (incl. some blank). Various sizes in folio. In folder, boxed; photostat of damaged cover, containing table of contents (ca. 1800), enclosed. – Déclaration des vignes . . . 1737 (no. 7), listed on cover, missing, while the last item (no. 12), Mémoire, is present in two practically identical copies.

FR. 143.

CHAILANE (near Murat, Dept. of Cantal, Auvergne). Livre de comptes, by an unnamed owner or his (or her) employees, referring to "mon beau-frère Lespinasse" (i.e., Comte Auguste Lespinasse?), with entries ranging from 1776 to 1806, and extensive for the years 1777–1782. The arrangement is not strictly chronological and especially the entries for the 1790s are added here and there at the bottom of various pages. *Chailane, 1776–1806.*

Paper. 429 pp., 5 ff. in smaller size tipped in at beginning. 37.5 x 25 cm. Damaged contemp. vellum, back cover missing.

FR. 144. (PROVENÇAL)

BATISTA and BALTASAR BUS. Conto. Financial notes and statements covering the years 1517 (f.6v) – 1541 (f.8v), but not in chronological order, concerning individuals in the region of Avignon, incl. the Jewish community (f.4r). On the verso of f.12 the title: Memoires escriptes par feu mon granpere M^r francois De Merles. *Avignon, 1541 and earlier.*

Paper. 12 ff. (ff.2, 9–11 blank). 31 × 21.5 cm. – See also Lat. 86. The writing of both MSS is, if not identical, at least very similar.

FR. 145.

BURGUNDY, Parliament. Traité des tailles suivant les usages du ressort du Parlement de Bourgogne. *Burgundy, 1768.*

Paper. 4 ff. (first blank), 305 pp., 9 blank ff. 22 × 17 cm. Contemp. calf. Ownership stamp “ex-libris Francois Tocaven” on title. – Partial contents: De la nomination des asseurs; De la nomination des collecteurs; Du devoir des collecteurs; Du receveur des tailles; Du privilege des nobles; Du privilege des ecclésiastiques; Des villes franches; Des surtaux; Additions (pp.267–75); Tables des matières (pp.277–305).

GER. 77.

LOWER AUSTRIA. Edict die zeitliche Erschein, oder Entschuldigung zu dennen bestchendten Erforderung bestchent (broadside on law procedure) dat. 24 Martii, 1668 (title on verso). *Actum Wienn.*

Paper. 1 f. 55 × 43 cm. Unsigned, unsealed. – In broadside drawer 35.

GER. 78.

HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE. Emperor Leopold I names Darius Freiherr von Neuhausz Obrist Veldwachtmäister (coronel). *Vienna, June 15, 1680.*

Paper. 1 f. 55 × 43.5 cm. Signed by Leopold, and countersigned. – In broadside drawer 35.

GER. 79.

HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE. Emperor Leopold I restates his order that military provisions be passed duty free. *Vienna, October 27, 1684.*

Paper. 1 f. 52 × 38.5 cm. Signed, countersigned, with seal. – In broadside drawer 35.

GER. 80.

HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE. Emperor Leopold I issues “General Mandat”

on tithes (relating to vineyards in the district of Vienna?). *Vienna, October 14, 1693.*

Paper. 1 f. 58 × 44.5 cm. Signed, countersigned, with seal. – In broadside drawer 35.

GER. 81.

HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE. Emperor Leopold I. "Patent" on tithes (similar to Ger. 80). *Vienna, October 18, 1694.*

Paper. 1 f. 58 × 44.5 cm. Signed, countersigned, with seal. – In broadside drawer 35.

GER. 82.

JOHANN WILHELM KRIEGER (Landphysicus in Unter Mannhartsberg). Diploma for the midwife Catharina Pichlein (?) having passed her examination. *[Lower Austria?], 1753.*

Paper. 1 f. 50 × 35.5 cm. Idem qui supra (i.e., J. W. Krieger) instead of signature, with seal. – In broadside drawer 35.

GER. 83.

HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE, Landeshauptmannschaft. Statement on behalf of Empress Maria Theresa to encourage marriages between her female subjects and her soldiers. *[Vienna] January 11, 1767.*

Paper. 1 f. 44 × 26 cm. Lower part (presumably with signature and seal) removed. – In broadside drawer 35.

MSS. Ger. 84-90, 95-96 were acquired as part of a large collection of printed decrees of the duchy of Brunswick-Lüneburg. Almost all of these manuscripts are also present in printed issues; they have not been carefully compared or collated, though a few cases of different spelling have been noticed.

GER. 84.

AUGUST, duke of Brunswick and Lüneburg. Copies of printed decrees, A – June 18, 1647; B – November 15, 1656. *Wolfenbüttel, 18th cent.*

Paper. A:6; B:4 ff. (incl. blank). 4^o. In folder. – A: on pollution of streets and rivers; B: easing burden of priests, school and church employees.

GER. 85.

RUDOLPH AUGUST, duke of Brunswick and Lüneburg. 7 decrees (A-G), October 9, 1682 – December 15, 1704. *Wolfenbüttel?, 18th cent.*

Paper. 4, 4, 2, 4, 4, 2, 1 (=21) ff. 4°. In folder. – Among subjects are tithes; scarcity of corn and prohibition of its use for distillation; inheritance tax, etc.

GER. 86.

ANTON ULRICH, duke of Brunswick and Lüneburg. 14 decrees (A–N), 1704–1719. *Wolfenbüttel, 18th cent.*

Paper. 4, 4, 2, 4, 6, 15, 5, 4, 2, 4, 2, 4, 4 (=60) ff. (incl. blank). 4°. In folder. – Among subjects are coinage; regulation concerning monasteries; tax on brandy; fire insurance; inventory of cattle, etc.

GER. 87.

AUGUST WILHELM, duke of Brunswick and Lüneburg. 9 decrees (A–I), 1714–1725. *Wolfenbüttel, 18th cent.*

Paper. 10, 2, 2, 2, 2, 4, 2, 2, 4 (=30) ff. (incl. 2 blank). 4°. In folder. – Among subjects are taxation (Stempelpapier); coinage; importation of beer; marriage, etc.

GER. 88.

LUDWIG RUDOLPH, duke of Brunswick and Lüneburg. 2 decrees (A–B), 1731–1732. *Braunschweig and Wolfenbüttel, 18th cent.*

Paper. 10, 4 ff. (incl. blank). 4°. In folder. – Deal with duties (A) and discharge of soldiers (B).

GER. 89.

CARL, duke of Brunswick and Lüneburg. 38 decrees (A–Z, AA–MM), 1741–1749. *Brunswick and Wolfenbüttel, 18th cent.*

Paper. 90 ff. (incl. a few blank ff.), 6 printed ff. 4°. In folder. – Among topics are Jews; beggars; guardianship; prohibition of gifts by government officials; illegitimate children; importation of beer; bankruptcy, etc. Enclosed in the regulation for stone masons (item J) are two copies of the printed decree.

GER. 90.

CARL, duke of Brunswick and Lüneburg. 35 decrees (A–Z, AA–JJ), 1750–1778. – *With: BRUNSWICK.* Formal oder Warnung des Meynicedes, ca. 1775 (KK). – IDEM. [Decree against heresy, magic, breaking into churches, blood sacrifices, rape, etc.], ca. 1770 (LL). – IDEM. 1 f. statement, 1793 (MM). – IDEM. Anweisung für die Orts-Vorsteher, 1821 (pamphlet). *Braunschweig, etc., 18th cent.*

Paper. 130 ff. + 32 pp. (pamphlet). 4°. In folder. – Among topics are guardianship; care of the poor; tithes; price of grain; coinage; games of chance; Jews; fire insurance; military service in foreign countries; mourning (5 regulations); surges; censorship, etc.

GER. 91.

BRUNSWICK-LUENEBURG. Official papers, partly detached from bound volume. 1. Dukes RUDOLPH AUGUST and ANTON ULRICH. On brewing of beer, November 25, 1695 (copy). - 2. Duke ANTON ULRICH. Inheritance regulation, December 15, 1704 (copy?). - 3. Duke CARL. 30 decrees, 1749-1785. - 4. Miscellaneous documents: a. Regulation on grinding of flour, Amt Lutter, 1786. - b. Financial agreement between Braunschweig-Lüneburg and Anhalt Zerbst (extract), March 19, 1772. - c. Duty regulation, January 4, 1782. - d. Salt regulation, February 16, 1788. *Brunswick-Lüneburg, 18th cent.*

Paper. 71 ff. (incl. blank). Folio. In folder. - Among topics are administration; tithes; gluttony; forests; coins; drunkenness; fire prevention; guns; beer, etc.

GER. 92.

[SWITZERLAND]. Loblicher Eydgnozs[c]haft Pündtnuszen und Vertr  g theils under sich selbsten theils mit anderen St  nden aufgericht sambt anderen merckw  rdigen Sachen. Text of 49 treaties and agreements (1251-1663), involving besides Swiss cantons and towns France and the Holy Roman Empire; altogether 68 texts, incl. at end section on peasant revolt of 1653. *Switzerland, last quarter 17th cent.*

Paper. 7 unnumb. (incl. 2 blank), 246 numb., 30 blank ff. 32 x 20.5 cm. Contemp. calf. - Four ff. with later additions (edges frayed) laid in.

GER. 93.

WILHELM, duke of J  lich, Cleve and Berg, Instructioenn . . . verordent in denn Amptcrenn des F  rstenthumbz Guilich [v]erkundigen . . . sollenn, followed by list Kirspell unnd Dorpffer in iederem Amt des F  rstenthumbz Guilich. *J  lich-Cleve, ca. 1600?*

Paper. 10 ff., following printed Ordnung und Reformation des gerichtlichen Process . . . (Cologne, 1562). 28.5 x 19.5 cm. - Ex libris Henrici Tesch Canonici (on printed t.-p.). Shelved as fGC55.J9307L.562 o.

GER. 94.

FRANKFURT a.M., Stadtrat. [Ordnungen] 1549, 1550, 1560 concerning city officials, legal matters, taxes and rules about holidays, appended to the printed Reformation der Stadt Frankfurt, 1509. *Frankfurt a.M., 1549-1560.*

Paper. 27 ff. of text. 30 x 21 cm. Hinched into near-contemporary vellum (not the original binding). - Bound and shelved with printed item fGC5.F8536L.509r.

GER. 95.

BRUNSWICK (Braunschweig)-LUENEBURG, Landtag. 1. Abschiede: 1591 (ff.5r-10r); 1592 (ff.19r-26r); 1594 (ff.29v-32v); 1596 (ff.33r-37r); 1593 (ff.49v-50v); 1603 (ff.51r-52v); 1605 (ff.53r-55v); 1606 (ff.56r-57v); 1607 (ff.58r-60v); 1610 (ff.61r-68r); 1614 (ff.68r-71r); 1616 (ff.83r-91r); 1624 (ff.109r-125v); 1635 (ff.127r-135r); 1637 (ff.137r-142v); 1638 (ff.145r-151v); 1639 (ff.154r-162r); 1640 (ff.163r-173r); 1642 (ff.175r-179r); 1645 (ff.181r-185r). - 2. Confirmatio privilegiorum: 1592 (ff.26r-29r); 1596 (ff.37v-38v); 1614 (ff.71v-72v). - 3. Vergleichung . . . nach Absterben Weiland Hertzogen Wilhelmen . . . [1592] (ff.10v-18v). - 4. [Duke Ernst answers gravamina 1599] (ff.39r-42r). - 5. Vertrag so Anno 1576 zwischen dem Hertzog zu Lüneburg vnd der Stadt erblich ist auffgerichtet (ff.42r-46v). - 6. Anschlag der bewilligten Türckenhülfse . . . 1593 (ff.47r-49r). - 7. Verzeichnis . . . [of levies] 1616 (ff.93r-101v). - 8. [Quota of payments to Sweden in connection with the peace treaty of 1648] (ff.189r-191r). - 9. Desideria [of the nobility] 1742 (ff.193r-204r). *Brunswick, 17th cent. (except no.9).*

Paper. Ff.5-204 (a few blank; ff.1-4 and 73-82 lacking); 20 ff. printed text (decree and proceedings on elections, dated 1752, by Duke George II). 32 x 21 cm. 18th-cent. boards.

GER. 96. (Ger. and Lat.)

BRUNSWICK (Braunschweig)-LUENEBURG. Ordnungen: 1. Schull-Ordnung . . . 1651 (pp.1-68; incl. chapters "De morum censura," "De lingua graeca," etc.) - 2. Vormundschafts-Ordnung [1689] (pp.71-98). - 3. Ordnung und Instruction der Vormundschafts-Herren [1689] (pp.101-21). - 4. Anderweite Verordnung, das Mühlen-Wesen . . . 1722 (pp.125-44). - 5. Leges pro discipulis scholae Guelpherbytanac (undated; pp.147-61, incl. sections on "De moribus extra scholam in templo, . . . in choro symphonico). - 6. Bau- und Zimmer-Innung . . . Innungs Brief . . . 1618 (pp.165-78). - 7. Zoll-Rolle . . . 1700 (pp.179-95; over 200 commodities). - 8-10. Rang Reglement . . . [3 texts, 1689 and 1691] (pp.199-221). - 11. Hospital und Armen Ordnung . . . 1660 (pp.225-78, incl. provisions for vagrants, students, beggars, etc.). - 12. Jagt Ordnung . . . 1603 (pp.285-314). - 13. Der Sciler-Gilde in Wolfenbüttel Artikul . . . 1704 (pp.319-39). - 14. Fernere Instruction . . . zur Rectification des Contributions Wesens [1685] (pp.343-53). - 15. Tabella welcher Gestalt das Brodt . . . zu backen . . . 1701 (pp.357-69), followed by "Register" (pp.371-2). *Brunswick, 18th cent. (post 1722).*

Paper. 372 pp. (incl. a few blank pp.) 19.5 x 16.5 cm. Near contemp. h/vellum. Unidentified bookplate inside cover.

GER. 97.

JOHANN AUGUST ERNESTI. Praelectiones in Petri Burmanni antiquitates Romanas. *Germany, second half 18th cent.*

Paper. Title, 199 pp., 2 ff. 24.5 × 20 cm. Contemp. h/vellum. Latin with German commentary. Prov.: E. L. Lenz (director, Gymnasium Weimar), 1809; E. L. von Leutsch. – Presumably lecture notes, with contemporary marginal annotations.

ITAL. 257.

CAMILLO ROMER. [50] Sonetti, in a careful calligraphic hand, *inc.*: Quel nuvol nero, e tempestoso verno/Che gran parte. . . . *Italy, 18th cent.*

Paper. 1 f., 50 pp. 21.5 × 15.5 cm. Small decoration on title, p.50 and on last page. Contemp. marbled paper.

ITAL. 258.

SUMARIO DELE RELATIONI da farsi a sua sanctità [Pope Paul III]: De la pace. – De Religione. Highly abbreviated report, apparently from Flanders, to the papacy, dealing with the relations between Emperor Charles V and King Francis I, Flanders, Spain, the Protestants, etc., with notations “1540, Relatione da farsi per me Giovanni Montep[ulcia?]no” in the same, and “117 Capitoli trattati tra l'imperatore et il re circa la pace” in a later hand on f.2v. *Flanders, 1540.*

Paper. 2 ff. 29 × 20.5 cm. Bds. – Old numbering [ff.]356–57.

ITAL. 259.

NICOLAS CHORIER. Versione italiana delle laide opera, versione elegante latini sermonis Joannis Meursii [pscud. of Chorier], e precisamente dei cinque . . . dialogi [La Disputa, wrongly titled Duello; Il Puttanazzo; La Fabrica; Il Duello; La Libidini]. *Italy, 18th cent.*

Paper. 36 ff. (last blank) with odd contemp. pagination (1 unnumb. f., pp.1–10, 35–46, 95–139) corresponding to the table of contents on f.1v. 27.5 × 19.5 cm. Bds.

ITAL. 260.

AGOSTINO BECCARI. Il sacrificio, favola pastorale. 18th-century copy of the printed edition, Ferrara, F. de Rossi, 1555, with addition from the edition of 1587. *Italy, early 18th cent.*

Paper. 52 ff. 20 × 16 cm. Bds.

ITAL. 261.

CESAR VICHARD, abbé de SAINT-REAL. Congiura de Spagnuoli contro la Republica di Venetia nell'anno M.DCXVIII, inc.: Trà tutte le intraprese. . . . *Italy, 17th cent.*

Paper. 31 ff. (several blanks (?) removed; the text is complete). 29.5 × 20.5 cm. Bds. – The text of the Italian translation (by Gregorio Leti?) was printed in Cologne in 1681 (cf. G. Melzi – G. Passano, *Dizionario di opere autonime e pseudonime*, Ancona, 1807, p.79). It seems likely that the present MS antedates this edition (the first French edition appeared in 1674); the text has not been compared with the 1681 edition. Folio 31v contains a quote in Italian from the *Memoirs* of [François] de La Noüe.

ITAL. 262.

BRA (Piedmont). Informationi contra il fonditore di Bra [Giovanni Battista Bruno]. Interrogation before judge Bonifacio Rinalta concerning the illegal manufacture of cannons, contrary to the regulations of His Highness [the Duke of Savoy?] of the year 1585. *Bra, January 18, 1588.* Notarized.

Paper. 6 ff. (last blank). 25.5 × 16.5 cm. In folder. – N.441 (archival number in slightly later hand) on f.1r.

ITAL. 263.

[GIOVANNI CAPONE]. Le staffilate date al Cavalier Tomaso Stigliani per haver mal ragionato contra l'Adone del Cavalier Marino [i.e., Giovanni Battista Marini]. Con una lettera in fine de' costumi della Francia (dated 1615). *Italy, second quarter 17th cent.?*

Paper. 47 ff. (1 f. missing between ff.36 and 37; ff.46–47 blank). 13 × 7 cm. Contemp. vellum. – Includes extensive sections of poetry. “Il presente libretto è opera di Gio. Capone,” verso of title page.

ITAL. 264.

LAUDI SPIRITUALI. Composite volume of manuscript and irregularly numbered printed pages from more than one source, incl. 29 printed pages with considerable MS and a few printed paste-ins. Ff. 1–5 are in a careful bookhand, the first item with heading Dic 30 Xbris 1638, beginning “Deh fa Madonna mia che'l buon pastore”; the remainder is written in a variety of cursives. *Naples, ca. 1639.*

Paper. 123 ff. (ff.5–10, 112–123 blank; incl. 139 full pages of MS, excl. paste-ins). 13 × 7 cm. Contemp. vellum. – Woodcut (Virgin and child) detail from unidentified title page, but with imprint In Napoli [P]er Lazaro Scoriggio, 1620 pasted on f.1r; printed parts of the volume may have originated in Scoriggio's press, but only one collection of this type of poetry printed by him is listed in G. M. Monti, *Bibliogr. della laude* (Florence, 1925), p.13, no.48.

ITAL. 265.

RACCOLTA DI POESIE. Begins with "Il Carnovale," *inc.*: Ecco gionto il carnovale/La staggione dei bordelli . . . ; many of these poems are dedicated to specific persons, among them Domenico Peretti (ff.49r, 50v), Marco Bembo (ff.61v, 67v, 73r), Francesco Fracassetti (who had sent tobacco from England to the unnamed poet; f.79r), Leonardo and Lucrezia Mozenigo (ff.82r, 116r), and Giorgio Alleprandi (f.86r). *Venice?*, *ante 1744*.

Paper. 160 ff. (ff.156-60 blank). 19.5 × 14 cm. Contemp. vellum. Faint stamp ("... Brescia . . .") on ff.3r and 4r; ownership entries on f.1r (dated 1744) and f.160v made unreadable. — Poem damning "Qui rapiet librum" on f.1r. Inscription of f.3r: Autore de queste poesie pare certo Pottido. Pare dalla poesia ad una monaca in St. Lorenzo che mandogli una pignatta di risi in dono (cf. ff.75-7).

ITAL. 266.

Sultan AHMED I. Lettera di comandamento del gran signore al capitano general di mare, tradotta da Barnabo Bruni. All'honorato visir e conseiglior mediator nelle cose del mondo, prudentissimo diffensore dell'i negotii de gli huomeni chel sereno [?] Dio per sua divina grazia lo faccia stabile, e forze, nella sua grandezza mio visir e capitano Ali Bassa chel sereno [?] Dio conserui con felicita. *Constantinople (or Venice?)*, May 16, 1617.

Paper. 6 ff. (last blank). 20.5 × 15.5 cm. Wrapper. — Request for cooperation with the Venetians against the "armata d'infidelli," i.e., pirates in the Mediterranean, perhaps involving the Spanish fleet.

ITAL. 267.

HISTORICAL MISCELLANY (nos.1-32), with anonymous Italian CANTI I (no.33, see note). *Italy, ca. 1686-ca. 1720.*

Paper. 262 ff. (ff.26-7, 35, 99-100 and 190 blank; various ff. possibly blank, removed; old numbering ff.35-313). 30 × 21 cm. Unbound; boxed. Contents: 1. DISCORSO del farsi superiori di soto per ottener piu facile la vittoria (contra i Turchi), ff.1r-4v [old numbering ff.35-8]. — 2. DISCORSO in materia di fortezze . . . (=Il MODO che ha da tenere il mastro di campo generale), ff.5r-7v [ff.39-41]. — 3. . . . Dalla MOLTITUDINE d'odorifici . . . , ff.8r-9v [ff.42-3]. — 4. PIETRO ANTONIO MOTI. [Degli Ottoboni bolognesi] Al Signore Domenico Maria Ottobono . . . Hore di nozze . . . 1688, with copies of letters from Antonio Ottoboni, 1685, and Card. Pietro Ottoboni, 1686, ff.10r-17r [ff.44-51]. — 5. GREGORIO LETTI. Alcune cose tratte dalla vita de Duca d'Osuna, ff.18r-25r [ff.52-9]. — 5bis. TAVOLA covering ff.63-219 [f.62r]. — 6. Count KONISEK (Koniček?). Lettera con osservazioni sopra d'un libro stampato nell'anno 1706 in Rotterdam . . . col titolo Ultimi Consigli, o sia Testamento Politico . . . (sopra gli stati d'Italia), ff.29r-34v [ff.63-8]. — 7. DECRETO del Senato circa i preti nobili . . . 29 Giugno 1699, ff.36r-39v [ff.70-3]. — 8. NOTIZIA del ingresso publico di Monsignore [Daniello Marco] Delfino . . .

1696, ff.40r-42r [ff.74-6]. - 9. DANIELLO MARCO DELFINO. Complimento fatto alla Maestà del Re [Louis XIV] . . . alla prima pubblica udienza . . . 13 Agosto 1695, f.43r-v [f.77]. - 10. DIFFERENZE in Roma tra il Cardinale [Cesare] d'Estrees col. Sig. Card. Niccolò Erizzo . . . 1700, *with* COPIA di viglietto scritto dall'ambas-sadore di Francia al Card. d'Estrees, and VERIDICA RELAZIONE dell'aggiustamento seguito tra il Sig. Card. d'Estrees et il Sig. Card. Erizzo, ff.44r-50r [ff.78-84]. - 11. Emperor LEOPOLD I. Lettere . . . scritte a Papa Clemente XI per l'investitura del Regno di Napoli, e successione ai regni di Spagna [1700], ff.51r-53v [ff.85-7]. - 12. Pope GREGORY VII. Pro sacra theologia . . . [with commentary, 1689], ff.54r-61v [ff.88-95]. - 13. SCRITTURA concernente la renoncia fatta dal Card. [Giambattista] Rubini del vescovato di Vicenza . . . 1700 . . . ff.62r-67r [ff.96-101]. - 14a-h. VILLA MARCIANA. Privilegium . . . 1475; Instrumenti antichi, 1473-1711, ff.68r-98v [ff.102-42]. - 15. CATHALOGUS EPISCOPATUS et totius diocesis Hadriensis, omnium canonicatum . . . omnium plebium . . . , ff.101r-113v [ff.145-157]. - 16a-i. MISSION TO CHINA, ff.114r-146v [ff.158-191]. a. CHARLES THOMAS MAIL-LARD DE TOURNON. Decreto del Sig. Card. Tournon intorno i riti de Chinesi (=Decretum a SS.D.N. Clemente Papa XI), 1704; b. Pope CLEMENT XI. Lettera . . . all'imperator della Cina, 1709; c. IDEM. Lettera al re di Portogallo, 1709; d. IDEM. Lettera . . . al Sig. Card. di Tournon, 1709; e. RIFLESSIONI de Gesuiti circa gl'affari della Cina, 1709; f. EPISTOLA ad superiores . . . qui sunt in Sina, 1706; JOANNES FRANCISCUS GERBILLON. Epistola; g. NOTAE in notas diversas iuxta decisiones Clementis XI, 1704, 1707; h. CHARLES THOMAS MAILLARD DE TOURNON. Lettera . . . a Monsig. Carlo Maigrot . . . con un breve del sommo pontifice al Carlo Maigrot, 1706; i. Due altre LETTERE concernenti lo stesso affare, 1706, 1702. - 17. Ufficio di CONGRATULAZIONE di Monsig. Abbate di Pompona . . . per il Doge Zuanne Cornaro, 1709, f.147r-v [f.192]. - 18. FRANCESCO ALBINI [?]. Sonetti, f.148r-v [f.193]. - 19. EPISTOLA ad superiores . . . qui sunt in Sina, ff.149r-150v (same as no. 16f [ff.194-5]). - 20. Per introvar l'INDIZIONE corrente in ogni anno, ff.151r-152r [ff.196-7]. - 21. King CHARLES III of Spain. Lettera al Conte Daun, vicere nel regno di Napoli, 1708, *with* Altra lettera del medesimo; Lettera del medesimo al Card. [Giuseppe] Archinto; Lettera del Card. Archinto [and others, 1708], ff.153r-157r [ff.198-201bis]. - 22. LETTERA di cardinali in Roma al imperatore Josepho [I] . . . , 1708, ff.158r-160r [ff.202-4]. - 23. Emperor JOSEPH I. Lettera alli ss. cardinali, 1708, f.161r-v [f.205]. - 24. Pope CLEMENT XI. Lettera dilectis filiis, nobilibus viris . . . Reipublicae Venetiarum, 1708, ff.162r-v [f.206]. - 25. IDEM. Breve . . . scritto al Sig. Ducca di Savoia . . . Amadeo (with answer), 1708, f.163r-v [f.207]. - 26. IDEM. [Lettera] dilectis filiis, nobilissimis viris, duci . . . Reipublicae Genuensis, 1708, f.164r [f.208]. - 27. Emperor JOSEPH I. [Lettera] Beatissimo . . . Patri Donino Clemente, 1708, ff.164v-165v [ff.208-9]. - 28. DISCORSO fatto all'inviato di Francia . . . al doge e Republica di Genoa, 1707, ff.166r-v [f.210]. - 29. EMANUEL DE LA TOUR BOUILLON. Lettera . . . al Re [Louis XIV] in occasione della sua p̄tenza di Francia, 1710, f.167r-v [f.211]. - 30. GIO-VANNI BATTISTA VENIER. Supplica all'scelto consiglio di dieci, 1714, f.168r-v [f.216]. - 31a-i. Pope CLEMENT XI. a. Grimani-Carpegna correspondence, 1708, ff.169r-185v [ff.217-32]; b. Dilecto filio . . . Vincentio S. Eustachii diacono S.R.E. Cardinali Grimano, *with* Riposta del Sig. Card. Grimani . . . ; c. VINCENZO GRIMANI. Lettera . . . alli sig. cardinali; d. GASPARRE CARPEGNA. Lettera al Card. Grimani, 1708, *with* c. Riposta, 1708; f-i, etc. - 32. CHARLES THOMAS MAILLARD DE TOURNON. Alcuni frammenti di lettere . . . scritte all'card.

segretario di stato in Roma . . . 1707, per informare la santa sede dello stato presente delle missioni in quell'impero [de Cina], ff.186r-189v [ff.233-40]. — 33. CANTI, inc.: Canto primo. Qual fu d'una discordia le ruine/Canto d'arme d'amori e di ambizion/ . . . , ff.191r-262r [ff.242-313].

SPAN. 56.

CANCIONERO. Collection of 205 poems, incl. 5 repeats, mostly by unnamed authors, but 2 by Camões, others by Luis de Leon, Fray Pedro de Ledesma and Mateo Rozas de Oquendo. *Leon or Estremadura, ca. 1600.*

Paper. 191 ff. (f.1 (title?) missing, a few leaves damaged. 21 x 15.5 cm. Contemp. calf. — Phillipps MS.4317. — Purchased on Lessing and Edith Rosenwald Fund.

SPAN. 57.

PHILIP II, king of Spain. Carta executoria, concerning the Villa de Valaderrey and the rights of Diego Gomez, his brother Julian (or Juan) and his sons Martin and Pedro. *Granada, 1576-1583* (with a few later additions).

Vellum. 54 ff. 31 x 21 cm. Painted crucifixion (with Gomez family) on f.1v-2r, arms on f.2v, landscape (Villa de Valaderrey?, rider in foreground) on f.3r; colored borders throughout. Contemp. blind-stamped leather over wooden boards (damaged). — "Esegorutoria de Juan Burgueño, Puebla Vecino de la Vil" inside front cover.

LEA 589. (Ital.)

GIOVANNI BATTISTA CASTAGNA. Registro di lettere di Mon.^{re} Archivescovo di Rossana [i.e., G. B. Castagna], che fu poi Papa Urbano Settimo, della sua nunciatura di Spagna sotto Pio Quarto, Pio Quinto, e Gregorio Decimoterzo. *Italy, latter part 16th cent.*

Paper. 2 vols. — v.I: 5 prel., 360 numb., 1 (incl. 6 blank) ff. — v.II: 4 prel., 416 numb. (incl. 4 blank) ff. 30 x 22 cm. Contemp. vellum, ownership stamp in v.I erased, in v.II cut out. Ex libris Abb. Francisci de Fucciis (v.I, prel. f.5r). — Cursory comparison with the *Correspondencia diplomática entre España e la Santa Sede durante el pontificado de S. Pio V*, ed. Luciano Serrano (Madrid, 1914), indicates that Lea 589 contains letters not published in this four-volume compilation.

LEA 590. (Lat.)

PTOLEMAEUS TANCREDIUS J[uris] D[octor] (pseudonym?) Ad investissimum Maximilianum II, cl. Rom. Imperatorem Augustum. Actionis

primae oratio. Pro fide catholica, de non concedenda confessione augustana.
With preface addressed to Pope Pius V (ff.1-2). *Prague?*, 1570.

Paper. 52 ff. 20.5 × 16 cm. H/calf; fore-edge title: Ad Pium Quintum oratio. Ex libris Guilford Coll.; part of Phillipps coll. no.4959 (old no.1237). – Ptolemaeus Tancredius could not be identified, nor does this name appear in the available MSS catalogues of Prague, Vienna or the Vaticana. – Purchased on the Lessing and Edith Rosenwald Fund.

LEA 591. (Lat.)

DE SACRO BELLO [contra Turcos] commentarius, with unsigned dedication to Pope Pius V (numb. ff.1r-2v), *inc.*: (text f.3r): Nisi longe maximum. . . . *Rome?*, 1567 (date of dedication).

Paper. 3 unnumb., 37 numb., 4 blank ff. 21 × 16.5 cm. Contemp. vellum. Guilford coll.; part of Phillipps coll. no.6123. – Purchased on Lessing and Edith Rosenwald Fund.

LEA 592. (Ital.)

CHIARINI FAMILY CORRESPONDENCE. Collection of (A) 39 letters addressed to Piero (or Pietro, also called Perugino) di Bernardo Chiarini in Venice, and (B) 3 documents in Latin. The former (A) were written by Piero's great-uncle Marco (nos.24, 36) from Florence; his father, Bernardo (nos.5, 10, 16, 23, 25, 29, 41-2), uncle Bartolomeo (nos.6, 9, 18?, 27, 31, 38), and brother Antonio (nos.2, 13, 22?, 40) largely from Spalato; his father's brother-in-law Rosso di Andreozzo (or de Orlandi; nos. 1, 4, 12, 14, 19, 21, 30, 32, 34) from Florence and Padua; from Petrus Paulus de Bentiis de Gualdo, archdeacon of Spalato (nos.15, 20); Andrea di Giovanni de Grissogoni (no.17); Lorenzo di Pacino (no.28); Andrea de Mazo (?; no.35); Francesco da Novate Petrarca (?; no.39); and a few from unnamed correspondents (nos.3, 11, 26, 37). The letters deal with family and business affairs and occasionally with political matters (e.g., Rosso sends a chronicle to Piero (no.4); sickness and death in the family (nos.10, 12); war between Lombardy and Florence (no.14); Piero's conduct (nos.16, 19); family disagreement (no.37); etc.) – The latter (B) concern Piero's marriage to Elisabetta Baldasarii de Ebriatis de Florentia (nos.7-8) and the death of Frater Angelicus Chiarini, OFM (no.33). *Italy*, 1390-99.

Paper. 46 ff. (a few defective or not complete). Various sizes in vol. measuring 33 × 23 cm. Fly leaf with pencilled title Spalato, 62 crossed out, and no.176. 19th-cent. boards. Phillipps MS.16435. – The collection belonged to a large archive, as evident from numbers on 21 documents (numbers in a 17th-cent. hand: 235-6, 239-49, 255-9, 262, 285-6, 297, 33?, 338-43, 347). Another Phillipps MS. (21499, present whereabouts unknown) included six letters to Piero. The Chiarini were a branch of the Davanzati. – Purchased on Lessing and Edith Rosenwald Fund.

LEA 593. (Lat.)

TOUL (Cathedral). Statutes of the cathedral chapter, written in 1497 by Nicolaus le Sane, lic. in utroque jure, archidiaconus de Portu . . . et canonicus, ff.1-76r. - *With*: an "inspeximus" by the chapter, dated January 14, 1650; extract from the registers of the chapter, February 18, 1695; *mémoire des divers fondations de messes*, 1635 (on paper); indices and notarial note on the margin of ff.88v, dated May 2, 1772. *Toul, 1497-1772.*

Vellum and a few ff. paper. 88 ff. (ff.79-81, 87v-88r blank). 28 x 21.5 cm. Near-contemp. blind-stamped calf. - Probably the earliest extant MS of the statutes (cf. MS.2F7 of the Archives de Meurthe et Moselle; MS.lat.10019, Bibliothèque nat., Paris; MS.3339, Bibliothèque Mazarine, *ibid.*). - Purchased on the Lessing and Edith Rosenwald Fund.

LEA 594. (Lat.)

MONTEARAGON (Benedictine Abbey). Cartulary containing documents on a wide variety of topics from the year 1051 to 1275, incl. royal endowments, donations, exchange arrangements, wills, inheritances, rights of tithes, exemption from duties, regulations governing vineyards (some leased by Jews), documents relating to the monastery of San Andrés de Fanlo, etc. *Aragon, second half 13th cent.*

Vellum. 103, instead of 104, ff. (a first f., probably blank except perhaps for a decoration or inscription, cut off; label on the first extant f. removed). 24 x 15.5 cm. Disbound, in h/f morocco cloth case. - *Repertorio de manuscritos referentes a la historia de Aragon* by Ricardo del Arco y Garay lists a few other MSS relating to Montearagon and Fanlo. - Purchased on the Lessing and Edith Rosenwald Fund.

LEA 595. (Ital.)

[ROME-] RIPA e RIPETTA. Libro degli statuti di Ripa per la sua antichità in tale stato, che per il continuo adoprarlo, rendendosi inutile, sarebbe di gravissimo danno à tutta l'Università de' Mercanti; il che ben considerato gli signori officiali pro tempore ordinaronon la presente copia . . . 1 febraro 1668 . . . Bernardino Finucci, notaro di Ripa Grande. *With additions to the year 1743. Rome, 1743.*

Paper. 320 pp. (pp.306-20 blank). 27.5 x 19.5 cm. H/vellum. - The *Catalogo della raccolta di statuti* of the Biblioteca del Senato, v.VI, pp.119-20, describes a similar MS, dated 1787. - Purchased on the Lessing and Edith Rosenwald Fund.

LEA 596. (Ital.)

CESARE FRANCIOTTI. Breve compendio del viaggio alla Sta. Casa di Loreto del Pre[te] Cesare Franciotti (ff.1r-37v), followed by Esortatione

ad andare in pellegrinaggio alla Sta. Casa di Loreto (ff.38r-45v), and Aviso al christiano pellegrino (ff.46r-47r). *Italy, first half of 17th cent.*

Paper. 1 blank, 47 ff. 13 × 10 cm. Contemp. vellum. – Primarily a brief chronicle of the origin and development of the holy shrine of Loreto, incl. in the later part references to the Turks. The relationship between this MS and Cesare Franciotti's much more extensive *Viaggio . . . distinto in dodici giornate . . .*, printed in 1616, has not been investigated.

LEA 597. (Lat.)

TRACTATUS de voluntate dei, *inc.*: Disputationes aggredimus. Disputatio I entitled "An in Deo sit voluntas" (f.1r), *expl.*: Laus Deo et Beatę Marię Virginī, atque Beato P[at]ri Augustino, et Beatę Matri Monicę, etiam Beato Nicolao Tolentinati et omnibus sanctis. *Italy, 17th cent.*

Paper. 40 ff. 19.5 × 13 cm. Contemp. bds.

LEA 598. (Ital.)

LIBRO della divina potentia, *inc.* (heading): Quessto libro tratta della divina potentia . . . (text): Nostro singniore i dio padre di charitade. . . . *Venetian Territory, second quarter 15th cent.*

Paper. 56 ff. (ff.1 and 54-6 blank). Most leaves have been remargined, one catchword (f.5v, "Del profeta") has no sequitur; early numbering disagrees with the sequence, but the text agrees with the table of contents (ff.50r-52r) in a near contemporary hand (in different spelling), except that item lxxiii "Come lotto di Sod-doma arivo . . ." is lacking (between ff.36-7). Ca. 29.5 × ca. 23 cm. H/vellum. Ownership stamp made unreadable (ff.2r, 52v). Giuseppe Martini Collection (dealer's information). – A history largely from the creation to Moses. "Nella sala de priore e scritto questo sonetto," *inc.*: Sella fortuna tafatto singnore, 14 lines on f.52r. Two calendar diagrs. (1426-61; 1403-04 entitled "lettere domenicali"), two tables (1403-37; 1400-36) and explanatory text on ff.52v-53v. – Purchased on Lessing and Edith Rosenwald Fund.

LEA 599. (Lat. and Span.)

ZARAGOZA, Inquisition. P[rocessus?] Honorabilis procuratoris fiscalis heretice et apostatice pravitatis Archiepiscopatus Ciuitatis Cesarauguste [Martin Garcia], contra Johannem de Gurrea Pelliparinum, habitatorem ville Exee [i.e., Egea de los Cabaleros] Militum, supra causa fidei, ff.1r-22v. – *With:* two further proceedings: A. Against Dominici d'Agreda, Johannes Crespo, and Gomez Garcia, ff.23r-33v (ff.28-30 are tipped-in documents). – B. Against Johannes d'Oria and his wife, ff.34r-48v. *Diocese of Zaragoza, 1487-1500* (the date 1511 on f.23r is in a later hand).

Paper. 49 ff. (ff.2, 19-21, 24, 32, 46-7 blank; ff.28-30 are larger in size and folded). 22 × 16 cm. Contemp. vellum spine (fragment of earlier document). – With some

corrections, and some later entries; especially the inscription *submissa est in procesu [!]*. Jacobi Trapez (f.1r) makes it likely that these proceedings were submitted as evidence during the trial of Jacobus Trapez, probably involving the accusation of adherence to the Jewish faith (see ff.22v and 49v).

LEA 600. (Lat.)

COLLEGIUM MELIVETANUM Societatis Jesu (later to become the Royal University of Malta). Collection of lectures, presumably held at the College, taken down by a student (Dominicus Pitardi?, whose name was erased and replaced by the second possibility, Andreas Agius). *Malta?*, 1670-77.

Paper. 187 ff. (incl. some blank) and 16 pp. printed text. 20 x 14 cm. Vellum, Domenicus Pitardi on spine. – Contents: In 3^a partem Angelici Doctoris (i.e., Thomas Aquinas) De sanctissimo incarnationis misterio, 37 ff. (ff.1-2, 21-5, 35-7 blank). – Tractatus de sigillo confessionis sacramentalis, 1 unn., 33 ff. (ff.29-33 blank). – Theologia moralis Jesuitica, 1 unn., 35 ff. (ff.31-5 blank); it begins with Disputatio tertia de potestate absolvendi, followed by Disputatio undecima de modis et conditionibus absolutionis a censuris, ff.1r-27r, and Tractatus de censuris . . . ac primo de excommunicatione, ff.28-64 (f.64 blank). – Metheora Reverendi Patris Salvatoris Coste . . . , 1 unn., 13, 2 unn. ff. – Printed: Assertiones philosophicæ, quas in Collegio Melivetano Societatis Iesu sub auspiciis . . . Fr. Don Ioannis de Galdeano defendendas exponit [Andreas Agius, handwritten], Neapoli, typis Passari, 1677, 16 pp., each page within woodcut border. Neither persons nor the titles could be verified in Backer and Sommervogel.

LEA 601. (Lat.)

JOANNES PAULUS COLAMUSSI (compiler). 1. De feudis, ff.2r-13v. – 2. De judicio assistentiae, ff.19r-33v. – 3. JOANNES BERNARDINUS MUSCATELLI. Praxis civilis modernissima Sacri Regii Consilii . . . , ff.34r-36v. – 4. Theoria practica (dated 1737), ff.37r-89v. (106 pp., 4 unn. ff.) – 5. De jure congrui, ff.90r-107v. (32 pp., 2 unn. ff.) – 6. De jure patronatus, ff.110r-134r. – 7. Ad titulum XXV. libri III Decretalium Gregorii IX, De peculio clericorum, ff.139r-145r. – 8. De verborum obligationibus ad titulum XLI Digestorum, ff.194r-207r. *Naples or Bari?*, ca. 1737.

Paper. 208 ff. (ff.14-16, 18, 108, 135-6, 138, 146, 148 and 208 blank; ff.192-3 and 200-01 pasted together). 20.5 x 14 cm. Contemp. bds. (spine partly missing). – Ex libris Abbatis Joannis Pauli Colamussi Rutilianensis Provinciae Barii on f.1r; his signature also appears at the end of some of the tracts, and he presumably was the compiler. In the same hand as Lea 602.

LEA 602. (Lat.)

[JOANNES PAULUS COLAMUSSI?] In quatuor libros juris canonici

commentaria, [aut] Institutionum canonicarum liber primus [–quartus],
inc.: Canonici iuris dignitate, necessitate, et commoda. . . . *Naples or Bari?*, *ante 1736* (date entered inside front cover).

Paper. 166 ff. (ff.2, 41–4, 93–7, 125–29 and 166 blank). 20 × 14 cm. Contemp. vellum, name Nicolà Fanzino inside cover. – Short notes on f.1r, incl. reference to Luther in connection with lib. II, titulus VI, “De eucharistia” (i.e., ff.71v–81v). In the same hand as Lea 601.

LEA 604. (Lat. and Ital.)

RESSANI DI FENILE, noble merchants of Pinerolo. 25 documents, 1559–1609, largely notarized. Purchases and sales of Giovanni, Cesare, Oratio, etc., and at the end of Catterina, widow of Baldassare Ressani, involving *inter al.* Josepho Martelo, Michael de Martinis, Vincenzo Pettito, including testimony of Paula Ballegna (Balligni), wife of Alessandro Ballegna, concerning property of the Ressani (Giovanni e fratelli); one document involves an iron foundry (ff.104r–108v). *Pinerolo, 1559–1609.*

Paper. 118 ff. (ff.13–15, 21, 29, 35, 67, 97, 103 and 113 blank). 26 × 18 cm. Modern h/cloth.

E. F. SMITH 63. (Lat.)

FRANZ JOHANN TANDLER. Collectaneum medicamentorum tam simplicium, quam compositorum conscriptum a me Francisco Joanne Tandler. *Leitmeritz (Litomerice), 1754.*

Paper. 2 ff., 100 (recte 101) pp., 4 ff. (index), 220 (recte 219) pp. (exordium medicamentorum; index, theriaca), 3 ff. 20 × 15.5 cm. Contemp. bds. with orig. calf spine and corners. – German interspersed in some places. Extensive pharmacopeia of a young apothecary, trained by Franz Alexander Hofer (see copy of letter on verso of last folio); he was born in 1735 acc. to a biogr. entry (see inside back cover), and this collection of prescriptions may have been submitted in connection with his application for certification (see copy of his Epistola petitoria pro condition[e] on last ff.).

E. F. SMITH 64. (Lat.)

DE GRAVITATE libri II. Extensive treatise in 122 paragraphs, difficult to read, probably lecture notes (cf. last sentence referring to this text being part of a *Physica generalis-Dissertatio 3^a*, cf. f.2r, *inc.*: Gravitatis nomine illa vis intellegitur. . . . Among references in the text are Aristotle (I, 2r, 12r; II, 2v); Archimedes, Ptolemaeus and Themistius (I, 12r); Descartes (I, 2r; II, 4v); Boyle (I, 2v, 5r, 12v, etc.); Boerhaave (I, 3r–v, 5r); Muschenbrock (I, 3r–v, 4v, 8v, etc.); Tschirnhausen (I, 3v); Newton (I, 4v, 7v, 9v,

etc.); Galileo (I, 8r; II, 5v, 6r, etc.); Maupertius (I, 9r, 10r, 11r), as well as Torricelli, Homberg, Bernoulli, Halley, Wolf, Godin, Bouguer, Riccioli and Baliani. *Italy or France?, post 1738 (ca. 1760?)*.

Paper. I: 19 ff. - II: 15 ff. (ff.12-15 blank). 29.5 × 20.5 cm. In envelope.

MUSIC 1. (Fr.)

ROIBIN, pseud. Text of letter to an unnamed person on the "procédé des bougies phosphoriques," signed Hiram (f.11v), a pseudonym explained by a note of Louis Dutens on f.1r: L'auteur de ce manuscrit étoit un François qui se cachoit sous le nom de Roibin, et étoit secrétaire du Comte de Saluces (Giuseppe Angelo Saluzzo). The inventor of the "procédé" is identified in this letter as M. Peilla de Turin. *France, or Italy, August 4, 1782 (or 1789?)*.

Paper. 12 ff. (last blank). 17.5 × 11 cm. - Attached to Comte de Challant's Procédé pour obtenir par l'union du phosphore de Kun[c]kel à des matières inflammables . . . des bougies, Turin, 1782. Reference to Priestley on f.3r.

MUSIC 1. (Ital.)

GIOVANNI PACIERI. Cantata a voce sola sopra la passione e resurrezione, inc.: Che rumor che tumulto. C major, voice and figured bass. *Italy, 4th quarter 17th cent.*

Paper. 24 ff. (ff.1-2, 23-4 blank). Oblong, 28.5 × 20.5 cm. Contemp. bds., no.18 on cover. Prov.: Paul Henry Lang. - MS. also recorded in Biblioteca Estense, Modena.

MUSIC 2. (Ital.)

VINCENZO TOZZI. . . Nisi Dominus A.9.V[oci] concertati. Parts for 9 voices (SSSAATTBB), viola and organ. *Messina, November 24, 1646* (date of performance?).

Paper. 14 ff. Ca. 25 × 19 cm. Unbound (in folder). Prov.: Paul Henry Lang. - Mentioned without location in MGG.

MUSIC 3. (Lat.)

LAUDATE PUERI à voce sola [ma?] con istruimenti [strings]. In C minor. *Solino[?], December 13, 1696.*

Paper. 8 ff. Oblong, ca. 28.5 × 22 cm. Unbound (in folder). Prov.: Paul Henry Lang.

MUSIC 4. (Lat.)

TRIUMPHATOR . . . flamarum ardantium, a voce sola. I. M. D. del
Ri[? rest unreadable]. In D major, "Spirituoso." *Italy, ca. 1700.*

Paper. 2 ff. (f.2v blank). Oblong, ca. 28.5 × 22 cm. Unbound (in folder).
Prov.: Paul Henry Lang. – Not in Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology*.

Giuntini's Correspondence with "Il Dubbioso Accademico" and Observations on Editorial Principles of the Renaissance in Italy and France

ROBERT C. MELZI*

THE story goes that one day Lodovico Castelvetro, the Italian writer and philologist, found himself in the company of his confrere Francesco Robortello, in a Venetian printer's shop where Boccaccio's *Decameron* was being printed. The work was being done under the guidance and leadership of Girolamo Ruscelli, who felt very proud of producing an emended edition, clear of all errors committed by previous commentators, and even free of any linguistic errors committed by Boccaccio himself. Proud of his *fiorentinità*, Ruscelli had placed another Florentine to oversee the project; and the good man, proudly extolling his master's editorial work, showed his visitors some of Ruscelli's marginal notes, one of which stated that the word *menomare è voce affettata*.¹

While speakers of the Tuscan and the Florentine dialect, in particular, pronounced the verb *affettare* ('to slice') with a closed *e*, and the same verb (with the meaning of 'to affect') with an open *e*, a native of Modena would feel no necessity for such a difference. Castelvetro could not resist this opportunity for a pun and, addressing the Florentine overseer, asked him whether this thing called *menomare* could be sliced like bread or watermelons. "No," answered the foreman, "*menomare* means to reduce in size or importance." "Io credeva," added Castelvetro, as long as Ruscelli believes the word to be "voce affettata, essere pane, o melone, o cosa tale, che s'affettasse, e si tagliasse in fette, come s'affetta, e si taglia in fette il pane e'l melone."²

This anecdote, found in an eighteenth-century edition of Castelvetro's works,³ tends to show the Modenese critic's position within the Italian *questione della lingua*. It should be noted here that, since Dante's *De vulgari eloquentia*, Italian men of letters held divergent

*Professor of Romance Languages, Widener University.

opinions on the origin and importance of the Italian language. The Tuscans, like Machiavelli and Varchi, declared the Italian language to be either Tuscan or Florentine. The famous Pietro Bembo, although Venetian himself, declared that only the Trecento examples of Petrarch and Boccaccio should be followed. Another non-Tuscan, G. G. Trissino, advanced the theory of an Italian language which would be the result of the amalgamation of several dialects. Castelvetro, although opposing Varchi's strict theory of Florentinity, admitted that Tuscan could be used as a core around which the Italian language would be built. The pun shows not only the Modenese philologist's opposition to strict Florentine but also the acidulous character of the arch-critic who had proudly adopted the motto *Kekrika*, meaning 'I have judged.'

One of Castelvetro's biographers, Attilio Ploncher, mentions a letter that Castelvetro, under the assumed name of "[Il] Dubbioso Accademico," was supposed to have written to the Italian editor Francesco Giuntini.⁴ This letter is recorded in the *Catalogue of Printed Books* of the British Museum, which describes it as "Critical remarks on the Decameron of Boccaccio, on the occasion of its reprint in 1555 by G. Rovillio, under the revision of F. Giuntini." The title of the book containing the letter mentions only the letter; but, in fact, it also contains Giuntini's reply, four sonnets of Boccaccio, one of A. Cambi Importuni on the subject of astrology, and an answer on the same topic by Giuntini. The British Museum tentatively places the publication of the book in Lyons in 1560, and states that "Dubbioso Accademico" was the pseudonym for Lodovico Castelvetro.⁵ For this attribution we have the confirmation of Apostolo Zeno, who identified "Il Dubbioso" as Lodovico Castelvetro.⁶ It appears that the British Museum relied on Fontanini's book, without trying to discover the academy to which Castelvetro could have belonged.

There were at least two academies of which our Modenese critic might have been a member, the Accademia Modenese and the Accademia degli Intronati. The Accademia Modenese was a loose gathering of young Modenese intelligentsia that congregated to discuss literature and religion. The Accademia was eventually dissolved by Ducal edict, but, since we have no records of any fictitious names ever having been used, it is doubtful that the title "Dubbioso Accademico" would refer to this academy. The Accademia degli Intronati

was formed in Siena prior to 1531, and is possibly to be given credit for the authorship of the play *Gl'Inganniati*. For a long time Castelvetro was believed to be one of the Intronati, the members of which seem to have been provided with pseudonyms. A recently found list of its members fails to mention the name of Castelvetro;⁷ but the list deals only with one period (possibly the middle of the 1540s), and it cannot be assumed to be complete. Since the authority of Fontanini-Zeno is generally quite reliable, we might hazard the conjecture that Castelvetro was known under the name of "Dubbioso Accademico" not for belonging to any *accademia*, but because of his critical and authoritarian character that prompted him to doubt anyone and anything.

The letter from "Il Dubbioso Accademico" can be attributed to Lodovico Castelvetro on the basis of more than Fontanini-Zeno's reliability, for internal evidence also leads to this conclusion. The author's keen philological acumen in linguistic matters points directly to the most alert of Renaissance philologists, namely our Modenese critic.

The question arises, next, as to the date of composition of the letter itself and of the book in which it appeared. The British Museum suggests that the date of the book is 1560, probably relying on the authority of Émile Picot, who observed that Castelvetro had necessarily to be in possession of a revised 1560 edition of a *Ragionamento* that is named by "Il Dubbioso Accademico" as the main reason for the writing of his letter.⁸

It would appear on the surface that the letter had been written prior to 1557 (the date of the first edition of the *Ragionamento*), since we read: "Io sono stato ausato di Lione da vno amico mio, che M. Guglielmo Rouillio⁹ vuole stampare le cento nouelle del Boccaccio in piccolo volume, nella correzione del quale intendo che sete adoperato. . . ."¹⁰ A less superficial look at the letter, however, will reveal marginalia that refer either to the 1557 or to the 1560 edition of the *Ragionamento*. This fact tends to refute any contention that the letter was written any great length of time before the publication of the book. It could have been written in the same year as the first edition, 1557, although Picot believes the book containing the letter (he may possibly mean the letter itself) to have been written about 1566, at a period of the Modenese's life when his vicissitudes brought

him to Lyons. Picot further shows the letter to have been printed in Lyons, since it bears the mark of the printer Jean Martin.¹¹

According to Ploncher,¹² Lodovico, having fled Rome because of fear of the Inquisition, apparently spent some time in Chiavenna and close to two years in Geneva; according to Péricaud,¹³ Castelvetro and his nephew seem to have passed two years in Chiavenna. Since both authors agree that uncle and nephew had arrived in Chiavenna in 1561, they would have reached Lyons in 1563, whether they stayed in Chiavenna or in Geneva.¹⁴ Whether the two were forced to flee Lyons in 1567 or in 1568 is open to conjecture. Ploncher mentions the first date,¹⁵ but from the account of the journey undertaken by the refugees from Lyons to Chiavenna and to Vienna, and from the date of a letter written by Emperor Maximilian to Duke Alfonso II (April 27, 1570), on behalf of the younger Castelvetro, one could surmise the departure from Lyons to have occurred in 1568.¹⁶ This is the date accepted by Péricaud.

Picot's theory would seem to agree with the fortunes of Castelvetro's life, were it not for a passage of the *Lettera del Dubioso*, where we read, on the subject of one of Petrarch's sonnets "che già sono 33. anni, che da M. Lodouico Casteluetro in voce & in iscritto fu eposto [sic]."¹⁷ This passage leaves Lodovico's authorship open to conjecture, and opens the door to the possibility that Lodovico's nephew, Giammaria, might have edited the book as he did his uncle's commentary on Petrarch.¹⁸ The original commentary on Petrarch seems to have been written in 1543; the *Lettera* under scrutiny, according to the thirty-three-year interval just mentioned, would then have been printed in 1576, after Lodovico's death, under Giammaria's editorship; this third possibility would reconcile the original authorship of the elder Castelvetro with the statement we read above, and would agree with Romani's dating.¹⁹

Castelvetro's letter first upbraids the author of the *Ragionamento* for having gathered his material from several sources and for being ignorant in the matter of literature. He gives many examples of what he believes to be literary obtuseness and makes, in the process, some very keen philological observations. He then proceeds, in his usual manner, to take issue with Boccaccio himself on the matter of confession in the description of the plague, and on the subject of advances made by religious men and women who try to obtain sexual

favors. He further finds fault with the author of the *Decameron* for having erred in verisimilitude, writing stories on the subject of maidens who engage in sexual intercourse for the first time, and on the subject of the great freedom that Boccaccio seems to grant lovers for their assignations. He finally engages in his well-known activity of fault-finder on some purported discrepancies on the matter of Sundays and the attending of mass.²⁰

It is interesting to observe that many of the remarks on Boccaccio are grouped exactly like the marginal notes that Castelvetro affixed to an edition of Dante's *Inferno*, with commentary by Cristoforo Landino, and that formed the basis of many of his later works.²¹ This would tend to give further credibility to the theory that the letter was written around 1543 and printed posthumously by his nephew Giammaria, inasmuch as the marginal notes mentioned above were probably penned during the later period of the Accademia Modenese.²² A final proof can be found in the close attention paid to religion in general and dogma in particular that characterized the Modenese's works prior to the Chiavenna period.

In his reply to Castelvetro, Francesco Giuntini agrees with him on the observations the Modenese had made on some of Boccaccio's alleged departures from verisimilitude; in doing so he also quotes Bembo's opinions that had been published in the *Prose della volgar lingua*.²³ The startling revelation, though, is his disclaimer of having ever read the *Ragionamento*, while we know that the printed edition carries, as I have already mentioned, references to the corresponding pages of the *Ragionamento*. In view of Francesco Giuntini's reputation among his confreres, this type of duplicity is not surprising. To give but one example, a few years after Castelvetro's death, which occurred in 1571, Jacopo Corbinelli was writing on April 16, 1578, from Paris to Gianvincenzo Pinelli, who lived in Padua: "Hora vengo all'ultima del XXII di febbraio, havuta hieri insieme con la nota di quelle povere scritture del Castelvetro. Io credo che l'habbi quello sfratato del Giuntino, poi che io mi vengo a ricordare che, utimamente [sic] che io passai per Lione, egli mi mostrò un bellissimo et singular libro di rime provenzali. . . ."²⁴

As is readily apparent, the *Lettera del Dubioso* and the *Ragionamento* are inextricably intertwined. Fortunately, in the holdings of the Rare Book Collection of the University of Pennsylvania I was able to

locate the *Ragionamento hauuto in Lione, da Claudio de Herberè gentil'huomo Franzese, & da Alessandro degli Vberti gentil'huomo Fiorentino, sopra alcuni luoghi del Cento Nonelle del Boccaccio*, printed by Roville in Lyons in 1557. Roville had also printed the 1555 edition of Boccaccio's *Decameron*, which is mentioned in the title page of the *Ragionamento*; the Rare Book Collection also owns this edition.²⁵ Among the holdings there is also a 1560 edition of the *Ragionamento* that I shall mention later on.

Although at the beginning of the second half of the century Lyons was already beginning to show signs of economic decadence, there was still enough wealth to keep Roville busy in all sorts of enterprises, most of which dealt with Italian authors and texts. Guillaume Roville (there are several versions of the name) was born in Touraine (near Loches) about 1518. After a stay in Paris, he seems to have spent quite some time in Italy, if we believe his own testimony. In a letter to Luca Antonio Ridolfi, in the preliminary matter of a 1550 edition of Petrarch, we read: "hauendo passati molt'anni mia giouentu nel paese d'Italia."²⁶ This would explain his interest in Italy and Italian books, and his excellent business relations with the famous Venetian printer Gabriel Giolito de Ferrari, with whom he shared some editions, and who had apparently been his master during his apprenticeship. Since his uncle was already a printer in Lyons, young Guillaume settled in that city and married Madcleine, the daughter of an Italian bookseller, Domenico Portonari.

His interest in Italian books was already evidenced in 1550 by the printing of a French translation of Gelli's *Circe*, which he dedicated to Catherine de Medicis, and by two editions of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*. In 1551 he printed Boccaccio's *De claris mulieribus* in a French translation entitled *Boccace des Dames de renom*, an edition of Dante's *Commedia*, two more editions of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, and one of Boccaccio's *Decameron*. In 1552 we find an edition of Dante's *Commedia*, a reprint of the French translation of the *Decameron*, and so on, every year for more than a generation adding one or two more Italian editions. In 1574, for example, he printed an edition of Petrarch which described "il vero giorno & l' hora del suo innamoramento." It is worth noticing that the Rare Book Collection owns most of the Roville editions I have mentioned.

Roville was an excellent businessman; when he failed to sell all of

the 1557 edition of the *Ragionamento* he reprinted the title page and the following pages through sig. A, and reissued the book in 1560. It is perfectly possible that the printing of the *Lettera del Dubioso* that I have already examined was an advertising scheme organized by Roville in cooperation with his business associate, Jean Martin, in order to promote the sale of the unsold copies of the *Ragionamento*.²⁷

Il Ragionamento is an extremely interesting book on many accounts: first of all, its interlocutors are shrouded in mystery; next, the book sheds important information on the status of Italian culture in France during the middle of the sixteenth century; it is an indispensable tool for understanding other Boccaccio and Petrarch commentaries; and finally, it is one of the finest extant documents on the Italian “questione della lingua.”

Émile Picot tried in vain to puzzle out the true identity of Claude de Herberè;²⁸ to my knowledge, no one has yet succeeded. Picot can only suggest, from internal evidence, that Claude de Herberè was a French gentleman who was familiar with the inner circle of the king’s sister, Marguerite, and that the general use of the Italian language at the French court had prompted Claude to remain in France two and a half years and study not only the Italian language, but also Boccaccio’s *Decameron*.

Picot was also unsuccessful in identifying the second character, though he did advance the suggestion that he might have been a relative of Niccolò degli Uberti, one of the collaborators in the 1527 edition of the *Decameron*.²⁹ There are a few clues, though, that escaped Picot, and this makes Alessandro degli Uberti’s true identity easier to determine.

Alessandro mentions, on the subject of the history of Lancelot and Galahalt, that the matter had been amply treated by Luigi Alamanni in his poem called *Avarchide*.³⁰ Quoting three octaves from the poem, he tells Claude that he, Claude, will be able to peruse it, just as well as he, Alessandro, was able to do. Alamanni’s epic poem was published posthumously in 1570, presented by Luigi’s son, Battista, Bishop of Mâcon, to Marguerite of France, Duchess of Savoy and Berry.³¹ The fact that Alessandro degli Uberti is able to quote three octaves with substantially no discrepancies from the 1570 edition indicates a close personal friendship with the author, who died in 1556, and

thus limits the search for Alessandro's identity to Alamanni's circle of friends.

After his second exile from Florence, Luigi Alamanni was first befriended by the King of France, Francis I; he then joined the service of Cardinal Ippolito d'Este, and was finally made Francis I's ambassador to Venice, Genoa, and to the Emperor Charles V.³² The date for the composition of the poem *Avarchiide* can be established by a letter addressed by Luigi's son, Battista, to Benedetto Varchi, in which Battista reveals that his father was already working on the poem in 1549. We further know that Luigi had completed a draft of the poem by the end of September 1554, but we do not know whether by the time death overcame him, in 1556, the poem was in final form. Neither do we know whether Battista did any editing during the fourteen years intervening between his father's death and the publication of the poem in Florence.

We should first investigate whether, under the name of Alessandro degli Uberti we can recognize the Italian philologist Benedetto Varchi. Alamanni and Varchi were close personal friends, having met during one of the exile's embassies; the two exchanged sonnets, and Alamanni is praised warmly in one of Varchi's main works, *L'Hercolano*. As a matter of fact, there is a great deal of similarity between some of the terminology employed in the *Ragionamento* and that used by Varchi in the *Hercolano*. As far as we know, though, Benedetto Varchi never set foot in Lyons and, since the *Ragionamento* was printed in that city, it seems hard to attribute to Benedetto Varchi the role of Alessandro degli Uberti.³³

Luigi Alamanni's son was also a close friend of Varchi who calls him in the *Hercolano* "mio carissimo, e virtuosissimo amico M. Battista Alamanni oggi vescouo di Macone."³⁴ It is not unlikely that the name Alessandro degli Uberti cloaks Battista Alamanni, who would express the ideas and theories of his Florentine friends.

The most plausible explanation can be found if we search for a common friend of both Varchi and the Alamanni; such a man is Luca Antonio Ridolfi, a Florentine who lived in Lyons.

The 1564 edition of Petrarch's *Canzoniere* by Roville contains an epistle of the printer, followed by one written by Alfonso Cambi Importuni, dated August 1562, and addressed "Al Molto Magnifico

Signor mio Luc' Antonio Ridolfi." The same edition contains another letter sent by the same Cambi Importuni to Ridolfi, followed by the latter's reply. In his letter, Alfonso Cambi Importuni praises the *Ragionamento*, and refers to it as the work of Ridolfi, who, in his reply contained in the same volume, does not deny the attribution. Probably on the basis of these facts, Campori says: "Nella stessa città [Lyons] diede in luce tre suoi componimenti senza porre il nome, cioè un *Ragionamento* sopra alcuni luoghi del *Centonovelle* nel 1557; un *Ragionamento* sopra la dichiarazione di alcuni luoghi di Dante e Petrarca nel 1560. . . ."35

At the very beginning of the dialogue, Alessandro wonders how Claude, being a Frenchman himself, and having just returned from a two-and-a-half-year stay in Paris, has learned the Italian language so perfectly. Claude explains that, soon after his arrival in Paris he had been introduced to the king's sister, Marguerite, and had become part of her inner circle. We assume she is the same "Marguerite de France, Duchesse de Barry, soeur unique du roi" to whom Roville had dedicated his *Promptuaire des medailles*, and to whom the younger Alamanni was to dedicate his father's *Avarchide*. In Marguerite's inner circle only Italian was spoken and, hearing this language, Claude found the desire arising to learn Italian to perfection. Furthermore, in addition to hearing the language spoken, he was daily subjected to lectures on several Italian authors, so that he decided to become an expert on Boccaccio's *Decameron*. Lyons was not the only French city in which Italian booksellers flourished; Claude relates how, needing several editions of the *Decameron*, he could easily procure such good editions "con l'aiuto d'vn Cartolaio Italiano, che in Parigi la bottega tiene. . ."36 And if we need further testimony of the importance of the Italian language in Europe at the middle of the sixteenth century, we need only to listen to Claude stating that "quella lingua [Italian] nominata che hoggi è cotanto in pregio, non pure appresso di voi altri Italiani tutti, ma etiamdio nella Corte del Cristianissimo & valorosissimo RE nostro, & per tutta la Francia tra le nobili & ingegnose persone (si come anchora hò inteso in non punto minor pregio essere nella Corte d'Inghilterra & in molte altre honoratissime Corti pur fuori d'Italia)."37

On the subject of Boccaccio's *Decameron*, the dialogue ranges from the meaning of the title, to the appropriateness of the subtitle "Prin-

cipe Galeotto," to the contents of Alamanni's *Avarchide*, to interpretative meanings of several passages as they are quoted in Roville's 1555 edition. The same strict philological exegesis is applied to many passages of Petrarch's *Rime diverse* and *Trionfi*, and to several passages of Dante's *Commedia*.

In the matter of the *questione della lingua*, Alessandro, who professes to be Florentine, alternates between Bembo's and Varchi's positions. He shows the greatest admiration for Bembo's *Prose della volgar lingua* and says: "... perchè anco in questa parte mi pare che in somma marauiglia debba essere tenuto il virtuosissimo Cardinal Bembo: il quale non essendo in Firenze nato, hà nondimeno così propriamente della nostra Fiorentina fauella ragionato, come sequella [sic] da natura hauuta hauesse."³⁸

On the question whether the Italian language, in which the books he reads are written, should be called "lingua volgare italiana," or "lingua toscana," or "lingua volgare fiorentina," his reasoning is very similar to that of Varchi who, as a title to the tenth *quesito* of the *Hercolano*, had advanced the question: "Se la lingua volgare, cioè quella, con la quale fauellarono, e nella quale scrissero Dante, il Petrarca, e il Boccaccio, si debba chiamare Italiana, ò Toscana, ò Fiorentina."³⁹ He is also careful not to go any deeper into such a subject, knowing that "... per parlarne compiutamente richiederebbe vna giornata intera. . . ."⁴⁰

The best pages of the *Ragionamento* are, without any doubt, those dealing with the duties of an editor, and the underlying principles of his work. Alessandro begins by giving examples of erroneous corrections sometimes made by thoughtless printers, sometimes by dishonest editors, but in the heat of the argument, he forgets his assumed name, and speaks as one who in truth has edited many other editions of Boccaccio, stating what his past practice has been, and promising what his future policy will be.

Claude observes that some texts have the version "Se con le beffe, & tal volta con danno solo s'è ritrouato: &c.," while others read "Se con le beffe, & tal volta col danno hassi solo s'è ritrouato: &c.," or "Se con le beffe, & tal volta con danno à se solo s'è ritrouato: &c.," or "Esso con le beffe, & tal volta con dano solo s'è ritrouato: &c.."⁴¹ It is possible, replies Alessandro, that the archetype had the word *esso* that would make better sense, changed to a *se* that does not seem to

fit. Since all printed texts, however, carry a *se* and not an *esso*, on his own authority he would never dare to make any corrections. If Claude wants to make any corrections, let him go ahead, but let him also be ready, later on, to be severely reprimanded.

There are some excellent texts of Boccaccio that should be adhered to; the 1527 Florence *Decameron* of di Giunta was praised by Bembo as one of the best, and this one, along with other good printed editions, and the best manuscripts should be followed and not altered. That other editors have changed and added words becomes apparent in their editions; in doing so they may have come closer to the true meaning than he, Alessandro, has, but only perchance. His policy has been not to add to, subtract from, or change any of the words he finds in the most reliable texts, trying rather to interpret the words, as he finds them according to the meaning that Boccaccio might have attributed to them.

Old texts should not be altered with impunity, adds Alessandro and, although he spent many long years in studying the language, the style, and the words of Boccaccio, he has never lightly changed words and made emendations as some other editors have done. It seemed to him that one should ". . . senza dubbio, essere molto rite-nuto & hauere somma (per dir cosi) religione di porre le mani ne gli [sic] antichi scritti de' lodatissimi huomini & rarissimi, come il Boc-caccio veramente fu, senza chiarissima cagione, & senza il consiglio di molti valenti huomini di questa lingua intendenti."⁴²

The editors of the 1527 di Giunta edition were not blind and saw perfectly well all the baffling passages that bother modern editors; they had in front of their eyes a manuscript, written in the hand of a Florentine, during Boccaccio's life; and they did not dare to make any emendations, although they were quite capable of doing so. Accordingly, he, Alessandro, has always tried to correct the errors committed by the printers, without tampering with the words of the author. He knows that many of his interpretations will be accepted by those who understand and love the Italian language; nevertheless, should he have erred in some passage, at least someone else "di mi-gliore intelletto che il mio non è, la ci possa con maggior perfettione & ordine dimostrare."⁴³

Is there any modern textual critic who would take issue with Alessandro's principles?

NOTES

1. 'To lessen is an affected expression.'
2. 'I thought . . . that a *voce affettata* [menomare] was like bread or melon or such things that can either be sliced or cut, the same way as bread and melon can be cut into slices.'
3. Lodovico Castelvetro, *Opere varie critiche* (Berna [i.e., Milan]; P. Foppens [i.e., Stamperia Palatina], 1727), p. 106. See Girolamo Tiraboschi, *Biblioteca modenese* (Modena, 1781), I, 434. Two title pages must have been printed for it, since Tiraboschi mentions that it was printed in Milan with the imprint of Lyons. The discrepancy between Bern and Lyons is explained by Giusto Fontanini in *Biblioteca dell'eloquenza italiana . . . con le annotazioni di Apostolo Zeno* (Venice: Pasquali, 1753), II, 41.
4. Attilio Ploncher, *Della vita e delle opere di Lodovico Castelvetro* (Conegliano, 1879), p. 100.
5. Dubbioso Accademico, pseud. *Lettera del Dubioso Accademico al . . . M. Francesco Giuntini* (Lyons?, 1560?), British Museum 11840.b.2. (2.).
6. Fontanini-Zeno, II, 31.
7. Price Zimmermann, "A Sixteenth Century List of the Intronati," *Bullettino Senese di Storia Patria* pubblicato dall'Accademia Senese degli Intronati, Anno LXXII (terza serie Anno xxiv, 1965), 91-95.
8. *Ragionamento hauuto in Lione, da Claudio de Herberè gentil'huomo Franzese, & da Alessandro degli Vberti gentil'huomo Fiorentino, sopra alcuni luoghi del Cento Nouelle del Boccaccio* (Lyons: Roville, 1557), attributed to Luca Antonio Ridolfi.
9. The name is variously spelled.
10. *Lettera del Dubioso Accademico*, p. 2. 'I have been advised by a friend of mine in Lyons that M. Guglielmo Rovillio intends to print a small edition of Boccaccio's *Decamerone*, and that you [Francesco Giuntini] have been entrusted with the editing.'
11. Émile Picot, *Les Français italianisants au xvi^e siècle* (Paris, 1906), II, 25, n.1.
12. Ploncher, pp. 82-84.
13. Antoine Péricaud, *Florent Wilson, Guillaume Postel et Louis Castelvetro* (Lyons, 1850), p. 11.
14. The date 1563 is confirmed by Lodovico Antonio Muratori who, in the "Vita di Lodovico Castelvetro" (*Opere varie critiche*, pp. 44-45), prints a letter, dated July 7, 1563, written by the Bishop of Modena to the Papal nuncio in Florence soliciting his good offices for Castelvetro; this communication had no influence on the pope; and indeed caused Lodovico to lose any further hope and depart for Lyons. Muratori mentions that the closing of the Council of Trent (Dec. 3, 1563) prompted Castelvetro's departure and, thus, places the event toward the end of 1563.
15. Ploncher, p. 85.
16. Ploncher, p. 88.
17. *Lettera del Dubioso*, p. 6. ' . . . that had been commented on by M. Lodovico Castelvetro 33 years ago, orally and in writing.'

18. Robert C. Melzi, *Castelvetro's Annotations to The Inferno* (The Hague, 1966), p. 97.
19. Werther Romani, "Lodovico Castelvetro e il problema del tradurre," *Lettere italiane*, 18 (1966), 177.
20. See Bernard Weinberg, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago, 1961), I, 183-184.
21. Melzi, *Castelvetro's Annotations*, pp. 39-57.
22. Melzi, p. 174.
23. *Lettera del Dubioso*, p. 26.
24. Santorre Debenedetti, *Gli studi provenzali in Italia nel Cinquecento* (Turin, 1911), p. 269. 'I come now to the last letter of February 22nd, which I received yesterday, together with the story of those poor writings of Castelvetro. I believe that they are in the hands of that unfrocked Giuntino, since I remember that, on my last visit to Lyons, he showed me a most beautiful and quite rare book of Provençal rhymes. . . .'
25. Giovanni Boccaccio, *Il Decamerone . . . Aggiunteci le annotationi . . . da Monsig. Bembo*. In Lione, appresso Gulielmo Rouillio, 1555.
26. Francesco Petrarca, *Il Petrarca con nuove et breui dichiarationi . . .* in Lyone, appresso Gulielmo Rouillio, 1550, as cited by Julien Baudrier, *Bibliographie lyonnaise*, neuvième série (Lyons, Paris, 1912), p. 175.
27. Baudrier mentions a 1558 edition of the *Ragionamento* and says of it "probablement édition de 1557 rajeunie." Baudrier, IX, 250-251. On the subject of the 1560 edition, Picot (II, 21) observes that "A partir de la p.9, le libraire n'a rien changé à l'édition primitive. Il a même conservé le f. d'errata." There is a small error here: p.9 (sig. B1^r) appears to be identical in the two editions.
28. Picot, II, 19-26.
29. Picot, II, 21.
30. *Ragionamento*, p. 13.
31. Luigi Alamanni, *La Avarchide* (Florence: Giunti, 1570). See Fontanini-Zeno, I, 272.
32. According to d'Ancona-Bacci, *Manuale della letteratura italiana* (Florence, 1925-28), II, 547, Alamanni was envoy from Florence to Charles V, French ambassador to Venice, and travel companion to Cardinal Ippolito d'Este. Little is known of his activity in Genoa, other than his deep friendship with Doge Andrea Doria.
33. In spite of the fact that *Due lezioni di M. Benedetto Varchi* was printed by Roville in Lyons in 1560. See Baudrier, IX, 268.
34. Benedetto Varchi, *L'Hercolau* (Venice: Giunti, 1570), p. 235. ". . . my dearest and most virtuous friend M. Batista Alamanni, now Bishop of Mâcon." In this quotation, and hereafter, italic and roman type are reversed when the main text is in italic type.
35. Lettere di scrittori italiani del Sec. XVI, *Scelta di curiosità letterarie inedite o rare dal Sec. XIII al XIX*, Dispensa CLVII (Bologna: Commissione per i testi di lingua, 1968), 307 [per cura di Giuseppe Campori]. In the same city, Lyons, he published three anonymous works, i.e., a *Ragionamento* on some passages of

the *Decameron* in 1557, and a *Ragionamento* on some passages of Dante and Petrarch in 1560.' Campori's statement concerning the two editions of the *Ragionamento* arouses the suspicion that he had not seen the work, but at least he knew something about it.

36. *Ragionamento*, p. 6. '... with the help of an Italian bookseller who has a shop in Paris.'
37. *Ragionamento*, p. 99. '... that [Italian] tongue which today is so much esteemed not only among the Italians themselves, but also at the court of our most Christian and most valiant King, and throughout France among noble and intelligent people (just as I have heard that it is prized not a whit the less in the English Court and in many other most honorable Courts outside Italy likewise).'
38. *Ragionamento*, p. 93. '... because even in this domain it seems to me that the most virtuous Cardinal Bembo should be looked at with the greatest admiration; because, although he was not born in Florence, nevertheless he spoke as naturally about our Florentine tongue, as if he had been a native of that city. . . .'
39. Varchi, *Hercolano*, p. 253. 'Whether the vulgar language which they speak, and that in which Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio wrote should be called Italian, Tuscan, or Florentine.'
40. *Ragionamento*, pp. 99-100. '... to discuss this subject thoroughly would require a full day. . . .'
41. *Ragionamento*, p. 28.
42. *Ragionamento*, p. 83. '... doubtless one should be very reserved and have, so to speak, the greatest piety, in laying one's hands on the ancient writings of highly praised and most excellent men, such as Boccaccio was, without having a very patent reason, and without having received the advice of many good experts in the language.'
43. *Ragionamento*, p. 88. '... endowed with a better intellect than mine will be able to interpret it with greater perfection and order.'

Bibliography of M. A. Shaaber

MARGARET L. SHAABER and WILLIAM E. MILLER

“Miscellany” [‘accomateria,’ ‘serv u self,’ ‘buyography,’ etc.], *American Speech*, 3 (1927-28), 67-8.

Some Forerunners of the Newspaper in England, 1476-1622 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1929). Reprinted: London: Frank Cass and Co.; New York: Octagon Books, 1966.

“Coleridge As a Journalist,” *Journalism Quarterly*, 7 (1930), 236-50.

The Art of Writing Business Letters (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1931).

“The History of the First English Newspaper,” *Studies in Philology*, 29 (1932), 551-87.

Reviews: Raymond Macdonald Alden. *A Shakespeare Handbook*. Revised and Enlarged by Oscar James Campbell (New York, 1932). Edmond L'Hommedé. *Le Secret de Shakespeare, Les Sonnets* (Paris, 1932). S. B. Liljegren. *Harrington and the Jews*, Bulletin de la Société royale des Lettres de Lund 1931-1932. IV. *Modern Language Notes*, 49 (1934), 136-8.

“Forerunners of the Newspaper in America,” *Journalism Quarterly*, 11 (1934), 339-47.

“The Furness Variorum Shakespeare,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 75 (1935), 281-5.

[With Matthew W. Black]. *Shakespeare's Seventeenth-Century Editors, 1632-1685* (New York: Modern Language Association of America; London: Oxford University Press, 1937). Reprinted: New York: Kraus Reprint Corp., 1966.

“A Note on *I Henry IV*,” *The Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, 13 (1938), 96-8.

“A Textual Dilemma in *I Henry IV*,” *Modern Language Notes*, 54 (1939), 276-8.

Editor: William Shakespeare. *The Second Part of Henry the Fourth, A New Variorum Edition* (Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1940).

“Gift from Henry N. Paul,” *The Library Chronicle*, 9 (1941), 39–41.

“News-sheets and News-books, 1500–1640,” *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* (Cambridge, 1941), 1, 736–46. *Supplement, 600–1900* (Cambridge, 1957), p. 330.

“Gerard Gossen,” *Notes and Queries*, 181 (1941), 66.

Review: William Ringler. *Stephen Gosson, a Biographical and Critical Study* (Princeton, 1942). *Modern Language Quarterly*, 4 (1943), 508–9.

Review: *Pleasant Quipps for Vpstart Newfangled Gentlewomen*, ed. Edwin Johnston Howard (Oxford, Ohio, 1942). *Modern Language Quarterly*, 4 (1943), 509.

“Weygandt, '91,” *Pennsylvania Gazette*, 71 (1943), 200.

“The Meaning of the Imprint in Early Printed Books,” *The Library*, 24 (1943–44), 120–41.

Review: W. W. Greg. *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare: a Survey of the Foundations of the Text* (Oxford, 1942). *Modern Language Notes*, 59 (1944), 139–41.

Review: George Stuart Gordon. *Shakespearian Comedy and Other Studies* (Oxford, 1944). *Modern Language Notes*, 60 (1945), 417–8.

“‘A Living Drollery’ (*Tempest*, III, iii, 21),” *Modern Language Notes*, 60 (1945), 387–91.

“*The Ant and the Nightingale* and *Father Hubbards Tales*,” *The Library Chronicle*, 14, no. 2 (1947), 13–16.

“Problems in the Editing of Shakespeare: Text,” *English Institute Essays* (1947), pp. 97–116.

[With Albert C. Baugh and Allan G. Chester]. *PMLA, American Bibliography for 1941: “English Language and Literature,”* [to 1955 incl.; after 1950 with Chester alone].

“The Unity of *Henry IV*,” in *Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies*, ed. James G. McManaway, Giles E. Dawson, and Edwin E. Wiloughby (Washington: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948), pp. 217-27.

Reviews: Isidore Joseph Semper. *Hamlet Without Tears* (Dubuque, Iowa, 1946). Harley Granville-Barker. *Prefaces to Shakespeare* (Princeton, 1946). *Modern Language Notes*, 63 (1948), 194-7.

“The Third Edition of *Wits Common Wealth*,” *The Library Chronicle*, 15 (1948-49), 56-8.

“Additions for ‘O.E.D.,’” *Notes and Queries*, 194 (1949), 508-9.

Editor: William Shakespeare. *The Tragedy of Macbeth*, Crofts Classics (New York: Appleton, 1949).

“Recent Literature of the Renaissance,” *Renaissance News*, 2 (1949), 41-4.

“A Letter from Mrs. Barry,” *The Library Chronicle*, 16 (1949-50), 46-9.

“Shylock’s Name,” *Notes and Queries*, 195 (1950), 236.

“The ‘Vnkleane Birds’ in *The Alchemist*,” *Modern Language Notes*, 65 (1950), 106-9.

Reviews: *The Tragedy of Philotas by Samuel Daniel*, ed. Laurence Michel. *Yale Studies in English*, vol. 110 (New Haven, 1949). *Peter Hausted’s Senile odium*, ed. Laurens J. Mills. *Indiana University Publications. Humanities Series*, no. 19 (Bloomington, 1949). *Ten English Farces*, ed. Leo Hughes and A. H. Scouten (Austin, 1948). *Modern Language Notes*, 65 (1950), 494-7.

Review: *Essays and Studies, 1950. Being Volume Three of the New Series of Essays and Studies Collected for the English Association*, ed. G. Rostrevor Hamilton (London, 1950). *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 2 (1951), 260-1. [Volume contains “The Basis of Shakespearian Comedy,” by Nevill Coghill; and “Shakespeare’s Conception of Poetry,” by E. C. Pettet. These are the subjects of the review.]

Marlowe’s Dr. Faustus, 1604-1616, Parallel Texts, ed. W. W. Greg (Oxford, 1950). *Modern Language Notes*, 67 (1952), 491-2.

“A Note on Hamlet’s ‘Abridgement,’” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 3 (1952), 381-2.

Review: *Thomas Heywood’s The Rape of Lucrece*, ed. Allan Holaday (Urbana, 1950). *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, vol. xxxiv, no. 3. *Modern Language Notes*, 67 (1952), 564-7.

Review: William Shakespeare. *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, Troilus and Cressida*, ed. Harold N. Hillebrand and T. W. Baldwin (Philadelphia, 1953). *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 4 (1953), 171-81.

Review: Muriel Clara Bradbrook. *Shakespeare and Elizabethan Poetry: a Study of His Earlier Work in Relation to the Poetry of the Time* (New York, 1952). *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 4 (1953), 343-4.

Review: Albert Feuillerat. *The Composition of Shakespeare’s Plays: Authorship, Chronology* (New Haven, 1953). *Modern Language Notes*, 69 (1954), 427-30.

Review: Alice Walker. *Textual Problems of the First Folio: Richard III, King Lear, Troilus & Cressida, 2 Henry IV, Hamlet, Othello* (New York, 1953). *Modern Language Notes*, 69 (1954), 436-8.

Review: Virgil K. Whitaker. *Shakespeare’s Use of Learning: an Inquiry into the Growth of His Mind and Art* (San Marino, Calif., 1953). *Modern Language Notes*, 69 (1954), 430-3.

“Luke Hutton’s Repentance,” *The Library Chronicle*, 21 (1955), 65-82.

“The Folio Text of 2 Henry IV,” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 6 (1955), 135-44.

Review: William Shakespeare. *The Complete Works, Including a Biographical and General Introduction, Glossary and Index of Characters*, ed. Charles Jasper Sisson (London [1954]). *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 6 (1955), 340-1.

Review: Leo Kirshbaum. *Shakespeare and the Stationers*, Graduate School Monographs (Columbus, Ohio, 1955). *Graduate Record* (The Ohio State University), 9 (Oct., 1955), 7-9.

Editor: *Studies in the Renaissance*, Volume II (1955) to Volume XIII (1966).

Review: William W. Appleton. *Beaumont and Fletcher, a Critical Study* (London, 1956). *Renaissance News*, 9 (1956), 217-9.

“The Bradner-Allen Inventory of Books by Latin Authors of the Sixteenth Century,” *Renaissance News*, 9 (1956), 166-7.

Review: Percy Simpson. *Studies in Elizabethan Drama* (Oxford, 1955). *Modern Philology*, 54 (1956-57), 56-7.

“*The First Rape of Faire Hellen* by John Trussell,” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 8 (1957), 407-48.

Editor: *Seventeenth-Century English Prose*, Harper English Literature Series (New York: Harper, 1957).

Review: Charles Jasper Sisson. *New Readings in Shakespeare* (New York, 1956). *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 8 (1957), 104-7.

Review: Maxwell Baldwin [i.e., Baldwin Maxwell]. *Studies in the Shakespeare Apocrypha* (New York, 1956). *Modern Language Notes*, 72 (1957), 290-2.

Editor: William Shakespeare. *The First Part of King Henry the Fourth*, The Pelican Shakespeare (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1957). Revised, 1970.

Editor: John Donne. *Selected Poems*, Crofts Classics (New York: Appleton, 1958). Reprinted, New Century Classics, 1964.

Review: Josephine Waters Bennett et al. *Studies in the English Renaissance Drama in Memory of Karl Julius Holzknecht* (New York, 1959). *Renaissance News*, 12 (1959), 282-4.

Review: Alois Maria Nagler. *Shakespeare's Stage*, tr. Ralph Manheim (New Haven, 1958). *Modern Language Notes*, 74 (1959), 745-6.

Review: Marie-Thérèse Jones-Davies. *Un peintre de la vie londonienne: Thomas Dekker (circa 1572-1632)*. Collection des études anglaises, no. 6, 2 vols. (Paris, 1958). *Modern Philology*, 57 (1959-60), 202-4.

Review: Edwin Haviland Miller. *The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959). *Renaissance News*, 13 (1960), 38-40.

Review (brief): *News and Rumor in Renaissance Europe* (the Fugger News Letters). Edited, with an Introduction by George T. Matthews (New York, 1959). *Renaissance News*, 13 (1960), 40-1.

Review: Thomas Dekker. *Dramatic Works*, vol. III, ed. Fredson Bowers (Cambridge, 1958). *Modern Language Notes*, 75 (1960), 265-7.

Introduction to Thomas Ravenscroft, *Pamelia, Centromelia, Melismata*, ed. MacEdward Leach (Philadelphia: The American Folklore Society, 1961). (Reprint of the First Editions, 1609, 1611.)

Editor: *Check-list of Sixteenth-Century Editions of Sixteenth-Century Latin Authors*. Trial Edition A (New York: Renaissance Society of America, 1963).

Review: Joseph Frank. *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper, 1620-1660* (Cambridge, Mass., 1961). *Renaissance News*, 16 (1963), 42-4.

“Shakespeare As Innovator,” *The Library Chronicle*, 30 (1964), 117-20.

Review: Clive Staples Lewis. *The Discarded Image: an Introduction to Mediaeval and Renaissance Literature* (New York, 1964). *Renaissance News*, 18 (1965), 19-20.

“Shakespeare 1963-1964,” *Renaissance News*, 18 (1965), 169-79.

“A Crux in *Religio Medici*,” *English Language Notes*, 3 (1965-66), 263-5.

[With R. C. Bald and W. A. Ringler]. Committee on Publications, Renaissance English Text Society, 1965-.

“Michael Archer’s *Dream of Bounden Duty*,” *The Library Chronicle*, 32 (1966), 89-100.

Review: Jean Jacquot, ed. *Le Lieu théâtral à la Renaissance — Royan-mont 22-27 mars 1953* [i.e., 1963] (Paris, 1964). *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 17 (1966), 179-81.

Review: Astley Cooper Partridge. *Orthography in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama: a Study of Colloquial Contractions, Elision, Prosody and Punctuation* (Lincoln, Neb., 1964). *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 17 (1966), 87.

“Recent Studies in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama,” *Studies in English Literature*, 7 (1967), 351–76.

Editor: Supplement to Albert C. Baugh et al. *A Literary History of England*, 2nd ed., vol. II, “The Renaissance” (New York: Appleton, 1967).

Review: Leonard Nathanson. *The Strategy of Truth: a Study of Sir Thomas Browne* (Chicago and London, 1967). *English Language Notes*, 5 (1967–68), 307–9.

Editor: *The First Part of Henry IV*, in *William Shakespeare: the Complete Works*, The Pelican Text Revised. General editor: Alfred Harbage (Baltimore: Penguin Books [c. 1969]).

“The Comic View of Life in Shakespeare’s Comedies,” in *The Drama of the Renaissance: Essays for Leicester Bradner*, ed. Elmer M. Blistein (Providence: Brown University Press, 1970), pp. 165–78.

Review: Walter Whiter. *A Specimen of a Commentary on Shakespeare. Being the Text of the First (1794) Edition. Revised by the Author and Never Previously Published*, ed. Alan Over, completed by Mary Bell (London, 1967). *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 21 (1970), 181–2.

Editorial Board: *English Literary Renaissance*, 1 (1970) – 9 (1979).

Reviews: *Shakespeare Survey*: 23, ed. Kenneth Muir (Cambridge, 1970). Carol Gesner, *Shakespeare and the Greek Romance: a Study in Origins* (Lexington, Ky., 1970). Patrick Murray, *The Shakespearean Scene: Some Twentieth-Century Perspectives* (New York, 1969). *Shakespeare’s Jest Book: an Edition of A Hundred Mery Talys* (1526), ed. Hermann Oesterly (Gainesville, Fla., 1970). *Renaissance Quarterly*, 24 (1971), 568–70.

“Shakespeare Criticism: Dryden to Bradley,” in *A New Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, ed. Kenneth Muir and S. Schoenbaum, pp. 239–48. (Cambridge: University Press, 1971). Translated into German as “Shakespeare in der Literaturkritik: von Dryden bis Bradley,” in *Shakespeare: eine Einführung* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1972).

Associate Editor: *Renaissance Quarterly*, Volume xxiv (Autumn, 1971) to Volume xxxii (1979).

“Polonius As Fishmonger,” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 22 (1971), 179–81. Exchange of views on the subject by LeRoy L. Panck and Shaaber, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 23 (1972), 126.

“Four of Richard Mulcaster’s Last Publications,” *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 66 (1972), 291–6.

“Five Incunabula in the Biddle Law Library,” *The Library Chronicle*, 39 (1973), 63–6.

Review: Charles Jasper Sisson. *The Boar’s Head Theatre: an Inn-yard Theatre of the Elizabethan Age* (London and Boston, 1972). *Renaissance Quarterly*, 26 (1973), 85–6.

“Notes on Some Printing-House Practices in the Sixteenth Century,” *The Library Chronicle*, 40 (1974), 124–39. [Bibliographical Studies in Honor of Rudolf Hirsch].

“Italian Plays Printed Before 1701 in the University Library,” *The Library Chronicle*, 40 (1974–76), 178–203.

Check-list of Works of British Authors Printed Abroad, in Languages other than English, to 1641 (New York: The Bibliographical Society of America, 1975).

Sixteenth-Century Imprints in the Libraries of the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1976). Supplements in *The Library Chronicle*, 41 (1977), 103–18; 42 (1978), 113–27; and 44 (1980), 153–64.

“Pistol Quotes St. Augustine?” *English Language Notes*, 14 (1976–77), 90–2.

Editor: William Shakespeare. *Henry the Fourth, Part Two: a Bibliography to Supplement the New Variorum Edition of 1940* (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1977).

English Seventeenth-Century Imprints in the Libraries of the University of Pennsylvania (Millwood, N.Y.: KTO Press [c. 1978]).

Editor (completing former editor’s work): Theodore Hornberger, ed. *A Goodly Gallerye: William Fulke’s Book of Meteors* (1563) (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1979).

Review: *Catalogue of the Pepys Library at Magdalene College, Cambridge*. General editor Robert Latham. Vol. 1: *Printed Books*, comp. N. A. Smith (Cambridge, Eng.; Totowa, N.J., 1978). *Analytical & Enumerative Bibliography*, 3 (1979), 120-9.

Review: Ernest B. Gilman. *The Curious Perspective: Literary and Pictorial Wit in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven and London, 1978). *Renaissance Quarterly*, 32 (1979), 434-5.

Catalogue of books in the Lea Memorial Library of the University of Pennsylvania to 1825 (being completed).

Elizabeth Grymeston's *Miscelanea*. *Meditations. Memoratives*: Introduction and Selected Text

B. Y. FLETCHER* and C. W. SIZEMORE†

WITH the advent of women's studies an increasing interest has arisen in early texts by women. One of these exciting rediscoveries¹ is the advice-book written by a Tudor woman, Elizabeth Grymeston: *Miscelanea. Meditations. Memoratives* (1604).² In its combination of practical advice and religious exhortation, the *Miscelanea* fits the tradition of middle-class female advice-books,³ but in its *memento mori* theme, its variety of rhetorical schemes, and its vivid sensual and metaphysical imagery, it breaks out of the advice-book mold into the literature of meditation.

Elizabeth Grymeston is listed in the Norfolk visitation records of 1563 as the fifth child of Martin and Margaret Bernye of Gunton, Norfolk. In 1584 she married Christopher Grymeston, the youngest son of Thomas and Dorothy Grymeston of Smeeton, Yorkshire. After their marriage Christopher and Elizabeth Grymeston moved to Cambridge where Christopher Grymeston continued his education at Caius College and eventually became Bursar in 1588. Both the Bernye (or Berney) and Grymeston (or Grimston) families had strong Roman Catholic leanings. The Bernye family was related to the Jesuit poet and martyr Robert Southwell. Furthermore, Elizabeth Grymeston's father, Martin Bernye, was accused of recusancy in 1587 and in 1595 lost his commission as Justice of the Peace when a servant testified that Martin Bernye and Christopher Grymeston had attended mass together at Gunton Hall. On the Grymeston side there were active Roman Catholic Grimstons in Nidd, Yorkshire; Caius College, to which Thomas and Dorothy Grymeston sent not only Christopher but his four brothers, was well known for its "popish" leanings under the leadership of Dr. Legge, although attempts were

* Assistant Professor of English, Georgia State University.

† Assistant Professor of English, Spelman College.

often made to “purify” the college. Elizabeth Grymeston herself was fined for recusancy in 1592/3, which, Mahl suggests, might have been the cause of her husband’s dismissal from Caius College and the Grymestons’ move to London where Christopher Grymeston entered Gray’s Inn in 1593.⁴

The intensity of Elizabeth Grymeston’s *Miscelanea* reflects some of the sorrows of her own life as well as her deep faith. As she explains in her prefatory letter, she is writing from her death bed to her son, Bernye, the sole survivor of her nine children. She fears for her husband’s life because of the *eight seuerall sinister assaults* already made on him and is anguished by her estrangement from her mother, whose *vndeserued wrath so virulent* she blames for her illness. The cause of the estrangement was possibly a dispute over Martin Bernye’s will, which settled the Bernye property on Elizabeth and Christopher instead of Thomas, son of Elizabeth’s deceased brother Francis.⁵ Whatever the source it caused Elizabeth Grymeston additional suffering.

The basic focus of the *Miscelanea* is revealed in the introductory letter to Bernye where his mother says: *I haue prayed for thee, that thou mightest be fortunate in two houres of thy life time: In the houre of thy mariage, and at the houre of thy death.* Elizabeth Grymeston even illustrates her capacity for wit as she urges her son not to defer marriage too long because *seldome shalt thou see a woman out of hir owne loue to pull a rose that is full blouwen, deeming them alwaies sweetest at the first opening of the budde.* The general spiritual and practical advice continues into the aphoristic first chapter and the memoratives, but most of the book moves on to her second and primary concern, the hour of death. The middle chapters of the book clearly follow the traditions of the “craft of dying”⁶ popular in both the Protestant and Counter-Reformation writings.

The most probable specific model for the *Miscelanea* is Robert Southwell’s *Epistle . . . unto His Father, Exhorting Him to the Perfect Forsaking of the World*, printed secretly by Father Henry Garnet in 1595 shortly after Robert Southwell’s death. Not only do the dominant theme and tone of Southwell’s *Epistle* match those of the *Miscelanea*, but Elizabeth Grymeston even borrowed from it in two places. She selected four sentences from the same page of the *Epistle* and listed them in her chapter entitled “Memoratives”:

The yoong man may die quickly, but the olde man can not liue long.

The chief properties of wisdome are to be mindfull of things past, carefull of things present, prouident of things to come [part of this phrase is also used in Chapter I].

The longer God stayeth, not finding amendment, the sorer he scourgeth when he comes to judgement.

Whoso passeth many yeeres, and purchaseth little profit, hath had a long being, and a short life.⁷

Elizabeth Grymeston sometimes took ideas more or less directly from Southwell,⁸ but she was also inspired by him to extend and develop her own images. For instance, in the *Epistle*, following the line of thought of the sentences lifted out for the memoratives, Southwell says: "The prerogative of infancy is innocency; of childhood, reverence; of manhood, maturity; and of age, wisdom." Mrs. Grymeston adopted the rhetorical scheme of parallelism but changed it to fit her lyrical second chapter: "Be *sorie* that thou canst not *sorrow*; thou that art begot in filthinesse, nourished in darknesse, brought foorth in pangs of death; thou whose infancie is a dreame; whose youth a frensie; whose manhood a combate; whose age a sicknesse; whose life miserie; whose death horror."

There is even a precedent for Elizabeth Grymeston's extensive borrowings in Southwell's *Epistle*, because he quotes from St. Cyprian, St. Chrysostom, and several times from St. Augustine. In fact, as Nancy Lee Beaty has shown, the whole tradition of the "craft of dying" is one of "enthusiastic plagiarism"⁹ as Protestants rewrote Roman Catholics and vice versa. Elizabeth Grymeston is not showing false modesty when she explains that "*neither could I euer brooke to set downe that haltingly in my broken stile, which I found better expressed by a grauer authour.*" She is merely following a set tradition. All of the unattributed poems, except for Southwell's *Peters Complaynt* in chapter XI and Verstegan's odes in chapter XIII, are from *Englands Parnassus* (1600), although she often changes them to fit her ideas.¹⁰ As Mahl and Koon point out, "her prose . . . frequently paraphrases Gregory, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Seneca, Virgil, Terence, Pindar, and others. She never claims originality . . . , but her literary gifts and fine prose style have produced a worthy legacy. . . ."¹¹

Her fine prose style is not only a result of the direct influence of Robert Southwell, but also the result of her use of the principles of

meditation in her writing and of the metaphysical nature of her images. Chapter III with its graphic evocation of hell and its parallel description of the suffering of each of the five senses is an indication of the "Jesuit 'composition of place' and 'application of the senses'" which, Louis Martz says, "develop[ed] into a brilliantly imaginative exercise."¹² Although the precise quality of a metaphysical image is hard to define, Mrs. Grymeston does elaborate her images. Also she sometimes deliberately relates the "transcendental to the simple or homely." This "type of radical image much used by certain Metaphysical poets" was not, Miss Tuve points out, "so common in the poetry of forty years before."¹³ For instance, in chapter IX, Mrs. Grymeston proposes the commonplace idea "let the Mount Caluarie be our schoole, the crosse our pulpit, the crucifixe our meditation," but then she continues: "his wounds our letters, his lashes our commaes, his nailes our full-points, his open side our booke, and *Scire Christum crucifixum*, our whole lesson." In the same chapter she develops an image that seems to foreshadow Crashaw in its close approach to catachresis: "since our sinnes (like fierce *Samsons*) haue murdered the lion of the tribe of Iuda, let our repentant thoughts (like bees) sucke at the flowers of his passion, and make hony to delight our selues and prouoke others." The image of someone sucking at Christ's wounds, the flowers of his passion, verges on the grotesque, even if the theological implications of communion are accurate. Mrs. Grymeston's vividness is yet another indication of the influence of the Counter Reformation on English style.

One of the pleasures of the *Miscelanea*, and one that this selection tries to convey, is its variety. Not only do the first and last chapters of aphoristic advice contrast with the other chapters' *memento mori* theme, but even the central chapters vary from the beautiful lyricism of chapters II, IV, and VIII on the transitoriness of life to the intense castigation of sin and the descriptions of the wiles of the devil in chapters III and V. The first ten chapters are included in this present selection, although the sonnet of dedication by Simion Grahame, printed by Hughey and Hereford, is omitted. The introductory letter and parts of chapter IV are anthologized by Mahl and Koon, but they are reprinted here because of their significance. The chapters of poetry by other authors have been omitted, notably, chapter XI, primarily quotations from "Peters Complaint" and a few medita-

tions on it, chapter XII, a madrigal by Bernye Grymeston, and chapter XIII (XIX of the later editions) of Verstegan's odes. After chapter XII later editions insert six additional chapters; editions after the second add the word *Prayers* to the title. Chapter XIII of the later editions was chosen as representative because it contains the long comparison of martyrs to silkworms that was borrowed first by Simon Grahame, who used it in his *Anatomie of Humours* (1609), and, again by Jeremy Taylor for one of his sermons.¹⁴ The other five chapters, omitted here, are on specific subjects: lasciviousness, repentance, majesty, murder, and the role of judges. The "Memoratives" (chapter XIV of the 1604 edition and chapter XX of the later editions) were omitted because most are probably derivative, as the Southwell borrowings show, and because representative examples have been included in the Mahl and Koon anthology.

Note on the Text

As the new *STC* will reveal, there are four editions of Grymeston's *Miscellanea*:¹⁵

- A: by Melchisidec Bradwood for Felix Norton. 1604. (*STC* 12407).
- B: by George Elde, for William Aspley. [bef. Oct. 5, 1606] (*STC* 12411).
- C: by Melchisidec Bradwood for William Aspley. [bef. 1609] (*STC* 12408/9).
- D: by Edward Griffin for William Aspley. [1618?] (*STC* 12410).

A full collation of the selection here reprinted confirms Hughey and Hereford's explanation of the textual relations. A, the only dated edition, is the first one. B copies A, adding six new and presumably authentic chapters between chapters XII and XIII of A. C is a copy of B, and D is a paginary (and largely line for line) reprint of C.

Each edition shows a small amount of unique variation which need not be rehearsed here. In the material here reprinted B varies from A and is followed by C and D in eight instances, two of them corrections of trivial errors and one the introduction of a manifest error. In III, 71, B makes the obvious correction of *aunexed* to *an-*
nexed and is followed by C and D; in VII, 43, B corrects A's *be* to *hee*, and is again followed by CD. B errs in changing A's *with* to *without* in III, 7, but the error is followed by C and D. The other

five readings where BCD join against A are generally indifferent. There is no evidence that B corrected A by reference to an authoritative source; only the added chapters must clearly have come from another exemplar.

C introduces several new readings in which it is followed by D against the evidence of AB or, in the added chapters, B. In I, 27, CD (*wayes*) differ both from A (*daies*) and B (*dayes*); in III, 50, they agree in reading *sometime* for *sometimes*. In IIII, 19, B prints A's *yer* as *yet* and is corrected to *ere* by CD. In IIII, 32, CD read *he is* for *is he*. They omit the Latin heading of chapter V; and in V, 4 and 11, they read *the* for *thy*. In the heading to chapter VII, CD substitute *No greater crosse, than to liue without a crosse* for AB's *Iugum meum suave*. In VII, 4, they read *God* for *he*; and in VII, 6-7, they change words (B, *wordes*) to *wounds* (D, *wounds*) and *flatterings* to *flattering*. In X, 8, they change *worke in night* to *working might*. In chapter XIII, where there are only three texts, they correctly emend B's *for to it* (14), its *causeth* to *caused* (64), its *smit* to *smitten* (87), its *approbation* to *approbations* (90), its *Psalmists* to *Psalmist* (119), and its *loadened* to *loaded* (197).

C varies uniquely but once, indicating that it is a relatively careful copy of B. This care is also shown in its much more coherent accidentals, which have led to its use as copy text for chapter XIII here. And D varies from all other texts at least twenty-seven times in the selection here printed.

There are six cases where B errs and is restored to the A reading by CD. These are all obvious corrections and need hardly be taken as evidence of conflation. In V, 18, B prints the nonsense *caue* to rime with *ure* and is corrected to *cure*; in VI, 2, B omits the obvious *kisse* which CD supply; in VI, 6, B makes *gesture* rime with *sisters* and is again corrected (to *gestures*); in VI, 15, B prints *no* for *not* and CD make the obvious correction to *not*; in VIII, 18, B makes a good Christian resist a singular *temptation* of plural *diuels* and is corrected to *temptations* by CD; and finally in X, 25, CD return B's *all* to the parallel construction *ill*.

The text here presented is that of A for all but chapter XIII, which is supplied from C. Only the most obvious conjectural emendations have been made, and these are all indicated by square brackets in text.

NOTES

The editors are indebted to the University of Chicago, the Folger, the Huntington, and the British Museum Libraries for permission to work with material in their collections. The introduction is by C. W. Sizemore; the text was established by B. Y. Fletcher, who wishes to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of Virginia Spears.

1. Elizabeth Grymeston has recently been "rediscovered" by several twentieth-century scholars. Mary R. Mahl and Helene Koon devoted seven pages of their anthology, *The Female Spectator: English Women Writers before 1800* (Bloomington and London, 1977), to the *Miscelanea*. Pearl Hogrefe included her in a list of "Other Noteworthy Women" in *Tudor Women: Commoners and Queens* (Ames, 1975). The most complete study remains Ruth Hughey and Philip Hereford, "Elizabeth Grymeston and her *Miscellanea*," *The Library*, 15 (1934-35), 61-91.
2. For this and later editions see the "Note on the Text" and Hughey and Hereford, pp. 61-71.
3. Christine W. Sizemore, "Early Seventeenth-Century Advice Books: the Female Viewpoint," *South Atlantic Bulletin*, 41, no. 1 (Jan. 1976), 41-48.
4. The biographical information comes mainly from Hughey and Hereford, pp. 71 and 81, but it has been corrected by Mahl and Koon who discovered both Martin Bernye's and Elizabeth Grymeston's fines for recusancy. Mahl and Koon, pp. 52-53.
5. Hughey and Hereford, pp. 74-76.
6. Nancy Lee Beaty has traced this tradition in *The Craft of Dying: a Study in the Literary Tradition of the Ars Moriendi in England*, Yale Studies in English, 175 (New Haven and London, 1970).
7. Elizabeth Grymeston, *Miscelanea. Meditations. Memoratives* (London: Melchisidec Bradwood for Felix Norton, 1604), sig. H2v. These with only slight alterations are found in Robert Southwell, *Two Letters and Short Rules of a Good Life*, ed. Nancy Pollard Brown, Folger Documents of Tudor and Stuart Civilization, no. 21 (Charlottesville, Va., 1973), pp. 8-9.
8. In chapter VII Grymeston borrowed an image directly from Southwell's *Marie Magdalens Funeral Teares* (1591) (Delmar, New York: Scholar's Facsimiles and Reprints, 1974), f. 43v.
9. Beaty, p. 158.
10. Hughey and Hereford, p. 84.
11. Mahl and Koon, p. 53.
12. Louis Martz, *The Poetry of Meditation*, Yale Studies in English, 125 (New Haven 1954), p. 136.
13. Rosemond Tuve, *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery* (Chicago, 1947), p. 217.
14. Hughey and Hereford discuss Grahame's borrowing of the Grymeston passage, pp. 79-80. See also Gavin Bone, "Jeremy Taylor and Elizabeth Grymeston," *The Library*, 15 (1934-35), 247.
15. We are indebted to Miss Katharine F. Pantzer for access to her files.

[Text]

To her louing sonne Bernye Grymeston.

My dearest sonne, there is nothing so strong as the force of loue; there is no loue so forcible as the loue of an affectionate mother to hir naturall childe: there is no mother can either more affectionately shew hir nature, or more naturally manifest hir affection, than in aduising hir children out of hir owne experience, to eschue euill, and encline them to do that which is good. Out of these resolutions, finding the libertie of this age to be such, as that quicquid libet licet, so men keepe themselues from criminall offences; and my mothers undeserued wrath so virulent, as that I haue neither power to resist it, nor patience to endure it, but must yeeld to this languishing consumption to which it hath brought me: I resolued to breake the barren soile of my fruitlesse braine, to dictate something for thy direction; the rather for that as I am now a dead woman among the living, so stand I doubtfull of thy fathers life; which albeit God hath preserved from eight severall sinister assaults, by which it hath beene sought; yet for that I see that Quem saepè transit casus, aliquando inuenit, I leave thee this portable veni mecum for thy Counsellor, in which thou maiest see the true portraiture of thy mothers minde, and finde something either to resolute thee in thy doubts, or comfort thee in thy distresse; hoping, that being my last speeches, they will be better kept in the conseruance of thy memorie; which I desire thou wilt make a Register of heauenly meditations.

For albeit, if thou prouest learned (as my trust is thou wilt; for that without learning man is but as an immortall beast) thou maiest happily thinke that if euery Philosopher fetched his sentence, these leaues would be left without lines; yet remember withall, that as it is the best coine that is of greatest value in fewest pieces, so is it not the worst booke that hath most matter in least words.

The grauest wits, that most graue works expect, 25

The qualitie, not quantitie, respect.

And the spiders webbe is neither the better because woenen out of his owne brest, nor the bees hony the worse, for that gathered out of many flowers; neither could I euer brooke to set downe that haltingly in my broken stile, which I found better expressed by a grauer authour. 30

God send thee too, to be a wits Camelion,

That any authours colour can put on.

I haue prayed for thee, that thou mightest be fortunate in two houres of thy life time: In the houre of thy mariage, and at the houre of thy death. Marrie in thine owne ranke, and seeke especially in it thy contentment and prefer- 35 ment: let her neither be so beautifull, as that every liking eye shall leuell at her; nor yet so browne, as to bring thee to a loathed bed. Deferre not thy marriage till thou commest to be saluted with a God speed you Sir, as a man going out of the

world after fortie; neither yet to the time of God keepe you Sir, whilst thou art in thy best strength after thirtie; but marrie in the time of You are wel- 40 come Sir, when thou art comming into the world. For seldome shalt thou see a woman out of hir owne loue to pull a rose that is full blouwen, deceiuing them alwaies sweetest at the first opening of the budde. It was Phœdra hir confession to Hippolitus, and it holdes for trueth with the most: Thesei vultus amo illos priores quos tulit quondam iuuenis. Let thy life be fomal, that thy death 45 may be fortunate: for he seldome dies well that liueth ill. To this purpose, as thou hast within thee Reason as thy Counsellor to perswade or dissuade thee, and thy Will as an absolute Prince with a Fiat vel Euitetur, with a Let it be done or neglected; yet make thy conscience thy Censor morum, and chiefe commander in thy little world: let it call Reason to account whether she haue subiected hir 50 selfe against reason to sensuall appetites. Let thy Will be censured, whether hir desires haue beeene chaste, or as a harlot she haue lusted after hir owne delights. Let thy thoughts be examined. If they be good, they are of the spirit (quench not the spirit) if bad, forbid them entrance; for once admitted, they straightwaires fortifie; and are expelled with more difficultie, than not admitted. 55

Crush the serpent in the head,
Breake ill egges yer [i.e., ere] they be hatched.
Kill bad chickens in the tread,
Fledge they hardly can be catched.
In the rising stifle ill, 60
Lest it grow against thy will.

For euill thoughts are the Diuels harbingeres; he never resteth, but where they prouide his entertainment. These are those little ones whose braines thou must dash out against the rocke of true iudgement: for

As a false Louer that thicke snares hath laied, 65
T'intrap the honour of a faire yoong maid,
When she (though little) listning eare affoords
To his sweet, courting, deepe affected words,
Feeles some asswaging of his freezing flame,
And sooths himselfe with hope to gain his game, 70
And rapt with ioy, vpon this point persists,
That parleing citie never long resists:
Euen so the serpent that doth counterfet
A guilefull call t'allure vs to his net,
Perceiuing vs his flattering gloze digest, 75
He prosecutes, and iocund doth not rest,
Till he haue tri'd foot, hand, and head, and all,
Vpon the breach of this new battered wall.

I could be content to dwell with thee in this argument: but I must confine my

selfe to the limits of an epistle, Quæ non debet implere sinistram manum. 80
To which rule I doe the more willingly submit my selfe, for that the discourses
following are motiues to the same effect: which I pray thee vse to peruse, even
in that my affectionate loue, which diffused amongst nine children which God did
lend me, is now vntited in thee, whom God hath onely left for my comfort. And
because God hath indued thee with so violent a spirit, as that quicquid vis 85
valdè vis; therefore by so much the more it behoueth thee to deliberate what thou
vndertakest: to which purpose my desire is, that thou mightest be seasoned with
these precepts in thy youth, that the practise of thy age may haue a taste of them.
And because that it is incident to quicke spirits to commit rash attempts: as euer
the loue of a mother may challenge the performance of her demand of a dutifull 90
childe; be a bridle to thy selfe, to restraine thee from doing that which indeed thou
maiest doe: that thou maiest the better forbeare that which in trueth thou oughtest
not to doe; for haud citò progreditur ad maiora peccata, qui parua reformidat;
hee seldomest commits deadly sinne, that makes a conscience of a veniall
scandall. 95

Thou seest my loue hath carried me beyond the list I resolved on, and my aking
head and trembling hand haue rather a will to offer, than abilitie to affoord further
discourse. Wherefore with as many good wishes to thee, as good will can measure,
I abruptly end, desiring God to blesse thee with sorrow for thy sinnes, thankeful- 100
nesse for his benefits, feare of his iudgements, loue of his mercies, mindful-
nesse of his presence; that living in his feare, thou maiest die in his fauour, rest in
his peace, rise in his power, remaine in his glorie for euer and euer.

Thine assured louing mother
Elizabeth Grymeston.

EN MA FOY IE SVFRE TOVT.

* * *

[MISCELLANEA.]

Tota vita dies vnum.

CHAP. I.

A short line how to leuell your life.

When thou risest, let thy thoughts ascend, that grace may descend: and
if thou canst not weepe for thy sinnes, then weepe, because thou canst not
weepe.

Remember that Prayer is the wing wherewith thy soule flieth to heauen;

and Meditation the eye wherewith we see God; and Repentance the 5
Supersedeas that dischargeth all bond of sinne.

Let thy sacrifice be an innocent heart: offer it dayly at set houres, with
that deuotion that well it may shew, thou both knowest and acknowledgest
his greatnessse before whom thou art. So carrie thy selfe as woorthic of his
presence. 10

Where thou owest, pay duetic: where thou findest, returne curtesie:
where thou art knownen, deserue loue. Desire the best: disdaine none, but
cuill companie. Grieue but be not angrie at discourtesies. Redresse, but
reuenge no wrongs. Yet so remember pitie, as you forget not decencie.

Let your attire be such, as may satisfie a curious eye; and yet beare 15
witnesse of a sober minde.

Arme your selfe with that modestie, that may silence that vntemperate
tongue, and controll that vnchaste eye, that shall aime at passion.

Be mindfull of things past; Carefull of things present; Prouident of
things to come. 20

Goe as you would be met.

Sit as you would be found.

Speake as you would be heard: And when you goe to bed, read ouer
the carriage of your selfe that day. Reforme that is amisse; and giue God
thanks for that which is orderly: and so commit thy selfe to him that 25
keepes thee.

*Teach me O Lord to number my daies, and to order my
life after this thy direction.*

CHAP. II.

*A mortified mans melancholy expressed in the person
of Heraclitus, who alwaies wept.*

Let him that laughes come weepe with me: for that which mirth ne-
glects, teares doe learne: It is the afflicted minde that is the touchstone of
faults committed: and the guilt which securitie ouerseeth, a troubled
minde doth soone discouer.

*A dolefull case desires a dolefull song
Without vaine Art or curious complement;
And squallid fortune into basenesse flung
Doth scorne the pride of woonted ornamant.* 5

Be *sorie* that thou canst not *sorrow*; thou that art begot in filthinessse,
nourished in darknessse, brought foorth in pangs of death; thou whose 10

infancie is a dreame; whose youth a frensic; whose manhood a combate; whose age a sicknesse; whose life miserie; whose death horror.

Thinke, ô thinke, and bethinke thy selfe, from whence thou camest, where thou art, and whither thou goest, for thou art here in an obscure land, gouerned by the prince of darkness, where vice is aduaunced, 15
virtue scorned, where pleasures are few, paines infinite: where want is miserable, plenty full of perill: in a vale of teares, enuironed on all sides with vnplacable aduersaries: where if thou subdue lust, couetousnesse assaults thee; if couetousnesse be vanquished, ambition will second hir; if ambition be surprised, anger succeeds: in a world of mischiefe, where 20
envy breaketh peace, ialousie sundreth friendship.

A wretched world, the den of wretchednesse.

Deform'd with filth and foule iniquitie,

A wretched world, the house of heauinesse,

Fild with the wreaks of mortall miserie.

25

O wretched world, and all that is therein,

The vassals of Gods wrath, and slaves to sinne.

Thou hast a silly, poore, yet powerfull soule, a soule of noble substance, of exceeding beautie, inspired by God the Father; redeemed by God the Sonne; sanctified by God the holy Ghost: this is the careful charge 30 committed to thy charge to keepe hir. Where wilt thou finde security for hir,

Which did in former time Gods image beare?

And was at first, faire, good, and spotlesse pure.

But since with sinnes hir beauties blotted weare,

35

Doth of all sights hir owne sight least indure.

But now exiled from hir-selfe, and as a widow depriued of hir espoused fellowship, committed to thy safe conduct where wilt thou secure hir? in heauen the *angels* fell in Gods presence: in paradice *Adam* fell from a place of pleasure: in the world *Iudas* fell in the schoole of Christ: and 40 if thou suffcrest hir to fall, she fals to eternall perdition, for the sword of Gods iustice hangeth alwaies ouer our soules readie for our sinnes to diuide vs from eternall blisse.

Since haruest never failes, but euer must,

Be torturd with the rackinge of his owne frame:

45

For he that holds no faith, shall finde no trust,

But sowing wrong, is sure to reap Gods blame.

Let the foote of him that sits vpon the rainbow be thy arke of securitie in this deluge of miseries; be not like the vncleane Crow, that can finde

footing on euery carion, with little care to returne againe: but rather 50
imitate the innocent Doue, that lothing abode without this arke, can finde
no rest; and with the wings of a longing desire and penitent heart, flicker
at the window of this arke, till thy heauenly *Noah* put out his mercifull
hand to take thee in.

55

*For when the soule findes here no true content,
And like Noahs Doue can no sure footing take;
She doth returne from whence she first was sent,
And flies to him that first hir wings did make.*

Let hir not drinke of the fluds of the vanities of this life, but as the dogs
doe of the riuier *Nilus*, that drinke running, least while they stay to 60
take a full draught, they be stung with scorpions: for she liues in thy
bodie no otherwise than as a lazare on his death bed, vncertaine of life,
but in apparent danger of endlesse death; within she makes her solace full
of sadness: hir hope full of hazard, and all hir waies strowed with Coc-
catrice egges, faire without, and foule within, make hir carefull of hir 65
steps. Thou hast the example of Christ: which way wilt thou goe? he is
the Way: whither wilt thou goe? he is the Trueth: where wilt thou stay?
he is the Life. If this Way lead thee thorow austere passages; if this Trueth
teach thee true contrition: if this Life be not atchieued but with a dolefull
pilgrimage; for where doest thou reade that Christ laughed? then *Woe* 70
be to you that laugh, for you shall mourne: and happy are you that lament, for
you shall be comforted.

CHAP. III.

A pathetrical speech of the person of Diues in the torments of hell.

O Death, how sudden was thy arrest vnto me? how vncpected? while
my bodie was strong, while my intrals were full of fat, and my bones were
watered with marrow; while I had rest in my substance, and peace in my
riches; in one night my soule was taken from me, and all my ioy was
turned into mourning. 5

*Like as the sacred oxe that carelesse stands,
With gilded hornes, and flourie garlands crownd,
Proud of his dying honour and deare bands,
Whilst theaters fume with frankensence around:
All suddenly with mortall blow astond,
Doth groueling fall, and with his steeming gore,* 10

*Distaine the pillars and the holy ground,
And the faire flowers that decked him afore,
So downe I fell on wordlesse precious shore.*

I saw my friends forsake me in a momant: I felt how haſd a thing it 15
was to ſcuer two ſuch old acquaintances as my ſoule and bodie: I wanted
no view of the vanities wherein I had delighted. On the one ſide hung a
register of my ſinnes committed; on the other ſide lay a catalogue of good
deeds omitted: within me boileſt my conuience confeſſing and accuſing
me: Before me ſtood the iudgements of God denouced againſt ſinne 20
ſo muſtered in ranke, as I miſt well perceiue my dangers were certaine,
and deſtruſion imminente. In this extaſie while I deſired but one houres
deſtay, I was caried with a motion *Torrenti ſimili*, as ſwift as the torrent
before the tribunall ſeat of God.

*Vnder whose feet, ſubiecte to his grace,
Sat Nature, Fortune, Motion, Tyme and Place.* 25

To this tribunall ſeat attended me my euill works, where Christ ſhew-
ing himſelfe, laid open vnto me the benefits he had beſtowed vpon me,
the rewards he promised me, the torments he ſuffred for me; all which the
diuell confeſſing, concluded me to be his; for that though he neuer 30
loued me, yet I ſerued him, though hee neuer gratified me, yet I obſeved
him, without wooing he wan me, performing what he ſuggested, em-
bracing what he preferred, affecting euerie thing he caſt in my way, all
which my conuience acknowledgiſt, censured me to this bottomleſſe
depth, to this profound lake, to this ſinke of the world, whither all the 35
afflictions and vnpleaſant things in the world draine and vnite themſelues
to take reuenge of ſinne.

*A deadly gulfe where nought but rubbish growes,
Which vp in th'aire ſuch ſtinking vapour throwes,
That ouer there may flie no bird but dies,
Chok't with the pestilent ſauours that arife.* 40

To this Chaos of conuinenſe, to this Well of perdition wherein I am
coarcted, to this burning lake of fire and brimſtone wherein I lie burning,
but not conuuing; lamenting, but not pitied; where I vomit out the
riches which I deuoured; in paine, without eaſe; in torture without 45
intermission; where my laſciuious eies are afflieted with moſt vgly and
fearefull ſights of griesely diuels; my cares that once were delicate, are
laden now with the hideous noife of damned ſpirits; my noife that once
was daintie, is cloied with the ſtinke of vnsuppoſtable filth; my taste that
ſometimes was curiouſe, and ſurfeited with plentie, is now tormented 50

with want; my imagination is vexed with apprehension of paines present; my memory grieved with the losse of pleasures past; my vnderstanding affected with the consideration of felicitie lost, and miserie found. Thus comparing senses pleasure with incumbent ioy, I finde my ioies abortiue, perisht ere they bud, my paines euerlasting, during beyond eternitie. 55

*Your fond preferments are but childrens toyes.
And as a shadow all your pleasures passe.
As yeeres increase, so waning [i.e., waning?] are your ioyes.
Your blesse is brittle, like a broken glasse,
Or as a tale of that which neuer was.*

60

Wherfore as one past cure, deiected beyond hope of redemption into endlesse perdition, rather condoling my misfortune, than expostulating my mishap whereof my selfe was authour, I call to you, the glory of your age, the meat of time, who proud in your errours, tread the path of worldly pleasures, wherein I was impathed: *Frustra, ò frustra hæc aliò properanti.* 65

*What in this life we haue or can desire,
Hath time of growth, and moment of retire.
So feble is mans state as sure it will not stand,
Till it disordered be from earthly band.*

70

It was a condition aunexed [i.e., annexed] to our Creation: *Intrasti vt exires*, thou wert borne to die. Nothing more sure than thy dissolution: no time more vncertaine than thy time of separation. Be alwaies readie to preuent that enemie, that is alwaies in readinesse to take aduantage. *Qui non vult in vita præuidere mortem, non potest in morte videre vitam.* 75 Who while he liues will not preuent eternall death, shall neuer after death inherit eternall life.

*Let every one do all the good he can:
For neuer commeth ill of doing well.
Though iust reward it wants here now and than,
Yet shame and euill death it doth expell.
Miser chi mal oprando, si confida,
Ch'ogn'hor star debba in maleficio occulto:
Che quand'ogn'altro taccia intorne grida,
L'aria la terra e'l luggo in ch'è sepolto.
E dio sa spesso ch'il peccato grida
Il peccator, poi ch'alcun di gli ha indulto,
Che se medesimo, seuza [i.e., senza] altruj rechiesta,
Inauedutamente manifesta.* 85

Wretched is he that thinks by doing ill,
His euill deeds long to conceale and hide:
For though the voice and tonges of men be still,
By fowles and beasts his sin shalbe describe.
And God oft worketh by his secret will,
That sinne it selfe the sinner so doth guide,
That of his owne accord, without request,
He makes his wicked doings manifest.
Shame followes sinne never so closely done:
Shame always ends, what wickenesse begun.

90

95

Hoc est momentum temporis vnde pendet aeternitas. The carriage of thy
selfe in this life, is the beame whereof thy welfare for euer dependeth.
Defere not thy amendment:

God is best when soonest wrought,
Lingring thoughts do come to nought.
O suffer not delay to steale the treasure of that day,
Whose smallest minute lost, no riches render may.

Turpe est eo statu vivere, in quo non statuas mori. In vaine thou liuest in
that estate of life, in which thou meanest not to die. Make, ô make your
saluation sure vnto you by good works. Encline your heart to doe good:
for the reward thereof is infinite: for he is comming and commeth
quickly, and brings his reward with him, to distribute to euerie one as he
hath deserued, euen according to his workes. *Omission and commission*
brought my confusion.

Cautior exemplo tu. Let my example prouoke you to detest that wherein
I tooke delight, lest you also come hither to be tormented not onely
with oppression of eternall punishment, but with omission of euerlasting
ioyes, which I admire now, *carendo non fruendo:* which if I might redeeme
by suffering all the torments that either tyrants have inuented, or martyrs
suffered; if with my tongue I might licke out the print of my feet out of
the way of sinners; if with teares of blood and water I might purge
my vncleanness to worke my redemption: *Ecce Domine paratum aegrum*
haberes in omnem medicinam. Beholde, ô Lord, thou shouldest haue a patient
fit for any cure. I would wring my drained eyes, *vt facilè sentires paratum*
ad omne supplicium ipsum habitum orantis Christiani. But since my glasse is
run, and my sun set; since death hath ouershadowed me, and that
there is no pleading after sentence; since that *serò dicit suspiria, qui non*
expectat remedium: since my affecting what I should haue desired, is turned
into a feeling of that I lost; *quia ex inferno nulla redemptio, quia paenarum*
nullus finis, suppliciorum nulla defectio; because there is no end for my hell,

nor satisfaction for my punishment: Therefore to you I call, to you 130
that carelesse liue, that feele not with what sense I speake. Consider,
Whence you came, Where you are, and Whither you go. You are parts
of that God that created all things for you, and you for himselfe. You liue
on the stage of the earth, *Vbi spectaculum facti estis Deo, Angelis, & hominibus*,
Where you are in the view of God, angels and men. And you are 135
going, ô looke to your going, *Non est vitæ momentum sine motu ad mortem*.
There is no mouing of life without a motion to death. You go and are
alwaies going to make your appearance before the tribunall seat of God,
where every man shall receiue according to his works. *Qualis vita, finis
ita: vt cecideris, ita eris*. As you fall, so he findes you: as he findes you, 140
so he censures you: and as he censures you, so he leaues you for euer and
euer. Wherefore, *quia arbor ad eam partem moriens cadit, ad quam partem
vivens ramos extenderat*, because as a tree falles, that way it swayes while it
is in growing: if you desire to fall right, learne while you are in your
growth, to sway the right way. Judge your selues, that you be not 145
iudged, *Vt sementum [i.e., sementem] feceris, ita metes*: What you sowe that
you reap, either a crowne of glorie, *quam nemo scit nisi qui accepit*, or a
chaos of confusion, *in qua sempeterius [i.e., sempiterius] horror habitat*, whose
worth can not be expressed, but of him that enjoyes it, or a masse of
confusion in which eternall horror doth inhabit. 150

CHAP. IIII.

Who lives most honestly, will die most willingly.

Sweet (saith *Chrysostome*) is the end to the labourers: willingly doth the
traueller question about his Inne: often casteth the hireling when his yeres
will come out: the woman great with childe will often muse of her
deliuerie: and he that knowes his life is but a way to death, will sit vpon
the thresholde with the poore prisoner, expecting to haue the doore 5
open to be let out of so lothsome a prison, looking for death without feare,
desiring it with delight, and accepting it with deuotion.

*For what's the life of man, but euen a tragedie,
Full of sad sighes, and sore catastrophes?
First comming to the world with weeping eye,
Where all his dayes like dolorous trophies,
Are heapt with spoiles of fortune and of feare.*

For it is onely death that vnloosest the chaines, and sets vs free from our
domesticall enemie. It is onely he, that wafts vs forward in this sea of

calamities, the danger whereof is shewen by the multitude of those 15
that perish by the gunshot of the diuels assaults, and by the rarenesse of
those that escape shipwracke.

Our frailties dome, is written in the flowers, . . .
Which flourish now, but fade yer [i.e., ere] many howers.
By deaths permission th'aged linger heere, 20
Straight after death, is due the fatall beere.

It is onely death that brings vs into harbour, where our repose is without
trouble, our comfort without crosses, where our teares shall be turned into
triumph, our sadness into ioy, and all our miseries into perfitt felicitie.

Death is the salve that ceaseth all annoy. 25
Death is the port by which we passe to ioy.

It is for brutes to feare death, whose end of life is conclusion of their
being. It is for Epicures to feare death, whose death is the beginning of
their damnation. It is for such as trafficke vanities, to looke to gaine griefe;
for such as haue sowen sinne, to looke to reape miserie; for those of a 30
desperate life, to looke for a damnable decease: but the good man that did
sowe in teares, by death shall reape in ioy; for his iudge is he who knowes
our weaknesses, and will acknowledge our infirmities: his accusers are
made dumbe by former repentance; his conscience is cleared by former
confession; hope is his staffe, to keepe him from sliding; grace is his 35
guide, to keepe him from erring; faith his assurance, to strengthen his
resolution: and what doth he lose, but fraile and tickle [i.e., fickle?] life, a
vapour that soone vanisheth, a drie leafe carried with euery winde, a sleepe
fed with imaginarie dreames, a tragedy of transitory things and disguised
persons, that passe away like a poste in the night, like a ship in the sea, 40
like a bird in the aire, whose tract the aire closeth?

Life is a bubble blouen vp with a breath,
Whose wit is weaknesses, and whose wage is death,
Whose way is wildnesse, and whose inne is penance,
Stooping to crooked age the host of grievance. 45

Who can sit in his studie and looke on his houre-glassse, and say not to
himselfe, *Vt hora, sic fugit vita?* that thy life is spent with the houre? Who
can walke in the Sunne, and looke on his shadow, and not say with *Pindarus*,
σκλας ὄντας ἀνθρώπος, Vmbræ somnium homo, Man is but the dreame of
a shadow? Or who can see the smoake dispersed in the aire, and not 50
say with the Poet, *Sic in non hominem vertitur omnis homo?* Canst thou feele
the wind beat on thy face, and canst thou forget that thou holdest thy

tenement by a paffe of windē? canst thou sit by the riuer side, and not remember that as the riuer runneth, and doth not returne, so is the life of man? Canst thou shoot in the fields, and not call to mind that as the 55 arrow flieth in the aire, so swiftly doe thy dayes passe? Or canst thou walke in the fields, and see how some grasse is comming, some newly withered, and some already come, and doest not remember that all flesh is grasse? *Miser homo, cur te ad mortem non disponis, cùm sis pro certo moriturus?* Miserable man, why doest thou not dispose thy selfe to death, since thou 60 art sure thou canst not liue? *Nostrum viuere, è vita transire:* our best life is to die well: for liuing here we enjoy nothing: things past are dead and gone: things present are alwayes ending: things future alwayes beginning: while we liue we die; and we leaue dying, when we leaue liuing. Our life was a smoake, and is vanished; was a shadow, and is passed; was a bubble, 65 and is dissolved. The poore mans life is led in want, & therefore miserable. The rich mans ioy is but vanity: for he is poore in his riches, abiect in his honours, discontented in his delights. This made *Hilarion* say, *Egredere: quid times, anima? octoginta annos seruisti domino:* Thou hast serued thy God fourescore yeeres, and therefore feare not now to goe take thy wages. 70 And *Ambrose*, *Non mori timeo, quia bonum habeo dominum,* Who feared not to die, knowing that he that came hither to buy vs an inheritance, is gone before vs to prepare it for vs.

O who would liue, so many deaths to trie,
Where will doth wish that wisedome doth reprove,
Where nature craves that grace must needs denie,
Where sence doth like, that reason can not loue,
Where best in shew in finall prooфе is worst,
Where pleasures vpshot is to die accurst?

Quid es; vides. Quid futurus sis; Cogita.

CHAP. V.
Speculum vitæ.
A sinners glasse.

What is the life of man but a continuall battell, and defiance with God? what haue our eies and eares beene, but open gates to send in loades of sinne into our minde? What haue our powers and senses beene, but tynder to take, and fewell to feed the flame of concupiscence? What hath thy body beene but a stewes of an adulteresse, but a forge of Sathan, where the 5 fire of our affections kindled with wicked suggestions, haue [i.e., hath] enflamed the passions of our heart, and made it the anuile to turne vs to

most vgly shapes of deformed sensualitie? What hath our soule, which is the receipt of the blessed Trinitie, betrothed to Christ in Baptisme, beautified with grace, ordeined with the fellowship of angels to eternall 10 blesse, what hath it beene, but a most vile broker, presenting to thy will allurements of sinne? what hath our will beene, but a comon harlot lusting after euery delight, wherein she tooke liking? what is our memorie, but a register of most detestable and abhominable facts committed by vs? what hath our reason beene, but a captiued vagabond, subdued by 15 euerie passion?

*The sinne that conquers grace by wicked vre,
So soyles our soules as they can haue no cure.*

So that by this *metamorphosis* we are become more odious to God then the diuell himselfe: for the diuell by creation was more beautifull then 20 we: it was sinne that deformed him, and that sinne that made him odious, makes vs detestable: for our sinnes are worse then his, and we not so good as he: for his sinne was one, & ours are infinite: he sinned before the stipend of sinne was knowne, ours after notice & experience of it: he sinned created in innocencie, we sin restored vnto it: he persisted in malice being of 25 God reiecte, we continue in hatred against him that recalled vs: his heart was hardned against him that punisht him, ours obdurate against him that allureth vs. So that our case is now such as infinite goodnesse detesteth, and infinite loue cannot condole. The earth was created for a place of pleasure, the aire was created temperate, creatures were made to be 30 obedient to man, all things framed to his best content: but see how sinne hath transformed pleasure into plagues, famine and murders many in number, grieuous in qualitie, and ordinarie in experience, which indeed are but *Initia doloris*, for the damned suffer death without death, decaie without decay, enuie without enuie; for their death euer liueth: their 35 end euer beginneth, and their decay neuer ceaseth, but are alwaies healed to be new wounded, dying but neuer dead, repaired onely to be anew decaied.

CHAP. VI.

The vnion of Mercy and Iustice.

There be two feet whereon God walketh on the hearts of men; *Mercie* and *Trueth*, which a sinner must fall downe with *Marie* and *kisse*, that in respect of Gods Iustice we may reteine feare, and in regard of his Mercie conceiue hope: for all the waies of God are Mercie and Truth; Mercie, that we may not despaire, and Trueth, that we may not presume. 5

O who shall shew the countenance and gestures,
Of Mercie and Justice, which faire sacred sisters
With equall poize doe euer ballance euen,
Th'vnchaunging proiects of the king of heauen?
Th'one sterne of looke, th'other milde aspecting,
Th'one pleaseid with teares, th'other blood affecting.
Th'one beares the sword of vengeance vreleenting,
Th'other brings pardon for the true repenting.

10

Because God is mercifull, wilt thou build a nest of sinne, as the Psalmist saith, vpon his backe? thou canst not seuer his Mercie from his Justice, 15 and then Justice will sentence, *Tarditatem pænæ, grauitate supplicij*. Is God a iust God, a terrible God, into whose hands it is a horrible thing to fall? Thou canst not separate his Justice from his Mercie: she wil proclaime *Misericordiam Dei super omnia opera sua*, his mercy exalteth hirselfe aboue his iudgements, *Vult enim omnes homines saluos fieri*. He that can that 20 he will, will not the death of one sinner, but that he may turne from his wickednesse and liue for euer: he offreth his mercy to all, but neuer vseth his iustice but vpon necessitie. I will sing vnto thee, ô Lord, mercy and trueth together, not mercy alone, as not fearing thy iudgements, nor trueth alone, as despairing in thy mercies: but thy mercies shall breed a loue, 25 and thy iudgements shall make me feare to impath my selfe in the way of sinners.

*For hope of helpe still comfort giues,
While Mercy still with Justice liues.*

CHAP. VII.

Iugum meum suane.

It is well obserued by one, That the rodde of the roote of *Jesse* flowred, that the sweetnesse of the flower might mittigate the scueritie of the rodde. The diuell is neuer suffred to punish vs farther then is for our benefit: for either he corrects vs for our former offences, or else to preuent our future infirmities. Neither is euery one that spareth, a friend, nor euery 5 one that striketh an enemie: but the words of a friend are better then the flatterings of a foe, and he that loues with austericie, is better then he that killes with delicacie. It is the diuels common course to kill our soule, while he flatters our fancie. For as the theefe that can not by open violence catch his bootie, seeketh by shrowding himselfe in valleies and bushes to 10 take the trauellers vnprouided: so the diuell, when by open pursuit he can not preuaile, he coutheth himselfe in briars and shadowes of worldly

vanities, entrapping vs before we preuent his traines. For albeit with a smooth flight and cuen wing he lessen himselfe into the clouds, as an eagle delighted to view the sunne: yet is he but a rauening kite, soaring in 15 the aire, the better to see how to seaze vpon his pray. God borroweth not the Syrens voice, when he would sting with a Scorpions taile, and when he bites with the tooth of a lion, he vseth not the teares of a crocodill, but as the husbandman lops his vine least the iuice should be spent in leaues: so least our mindes should be imploied in vaine and superfluous plea- 20 sures; our wits which without profit would be diffused, are by him kept in compasse by tribulation. For where he purposeth to heale, he spareth not to launce: and if he see thou be fostered by the world thy naturall nurse, he can annoint hir teate with the bitterness of discontent, to weane thee from hir: for he that bindes the frantick, and awakes the lethar- 25 gee, is troublesome, but friendly to both.

*If ought can touch vs ought, afflictions lookes
Makes vs to looke into our selues so neere,
Teach vs to know our selues beyond all bookees,
Or all the learned schooles that euer were.
This makes our senses quicke, and reason cleare,
Resolves our will, and rectifies our thoughts,
So doe the windes and thunder clelse the aire,
So lopt and pruned trees do flourish faire.*

30

Be not discouraged; thou art a Christian, whose captaine is a Cru- 35 cifice, whose standard the Crosse, whose armour Patience, whose battell Persecution, whose victorie Death. Whether God fostreth thee as a weaking, or exercise thee as one stronger, or checke thee as one vnruly; yet he tendreth all as his owne children. Behold thy Sauiour with his head full of thornes, his eies full of teares, his eares full of blasphemies, his 40 mouth full of gal, his body full of wounds, his heart full of sorrow; and blame him not, if ere thou find him, he giue thee a sippe of the chalice whereof be [i.e., hee] drunke so full a cuppe. Thy loue must be great, when his sorrow is more at thy ingratitudo, then at his owne affliction, when he lost himselfe to winne thee: a worke without example, a grace beyond 45 merite, a charitic surpassing measure. Wherefore whether he set thee to seeke him in the pouerty of the crib and manger, or in the agony of his bloody sweat in the garden, or in the middest of reproches and false accusations before the tribunall, or in the torments of a shamefull death; yet thinke thy selfe as deepe in his fauour for being tried by the tor- 50 ments of his passion, as those that are called by the testimonie of his glorious transfiguration.

CHAP. VIII.

That feare to die is the effect of an enill life.

Iohannes Patriarch of *Alexandria*, whose frequent deeds of charity gaue him this Epithete, to be called *Iohannes Eleemosynarius* hauing his tombe in building, gaue his people in charge, that it should be left vnfinished, and that euerie day one should put him in minde to perfect it. His meaning was, that by that meanes hauing his thoughts fixed of the doore of ⁵ death, he might the better prepare himselfe for the passage through it. The Pope that day he is chosen, hath one comes to him with foure marble stones, as patterns to choose of which his tombe shall be built. He that raketh vp vertue in the ashes of the memorie of death, shall finde hir force so vnted, that when they come to be vnraked, they shall finde that hir ¹⁰ heate will so encourage vs, that when our soule findeth a vent to mount vp to hir naturall Sphere, she will flame in the firmament, and shine most oriently to our excessiue comfort, and hir Creators inestimable glorie: for he whose life was a studie to die, well knowes that death hath lost his tartenesse by passing through the veines of life: he feares not his cold ¹⁵ sweats, nor forgoing gripes, but taketh them as throwes in childe-bed, by which our soule is brought out of a lothsome body into eternall felicitie. He feares not the diuels, whose temptations he hath valiantly resisted: the graue is no horror to him, for he knowes he sowes the body in corruption to reapre it againe in immortalitie. He that liueth well, shall make a ²⁰ good end, and in the day of death his decease shall be blessed, for he resteth from his labours, and his works doe follow him. But to him that liueth ill, death is an euer dying death: he lies tormented with the pangues of the dying flesh, amazed with the corrosiue fittes of the minde, frighted with terror of that is to come, grieved with remorse of that which is past, ²⁵ stung with the gnawing of a guiltie conscience, terrified with the rigor of a seuere iudge, vexed with approch of a lothsome sepulchre. They made their prison their paradise, their bellie their God, their appetite their guide: so sowing sinne, they reapre miseric, traffiking vanities, they gaine griefe: detestable was their life, and damnable is their decease. ³⁰

Absit mihi gloriari nisi in Christo.

CHAP. IX.

That affliction is the coate of a Christian.

If we be Christians, affliction is our coat, and the Crosse our cognizance, *In hoc signo vinces*: Christs clouts comfort not those that walke in side robes.

The stable and manger are no refreshings to such as loue the highest roomes in the Synagogue. Our arke lieth not *in papilionibus*, but *in præsepio*. If we be members of that head which was prickt with thornes, let the rest of the parts sympathize with it: let the Mount Caluarie be our schoole, the crosse our pulpit, the crucifixe our meditation, his wounds our letters, his lashes our commaes, his nailes our full-points, his open side our booke, and *Scire Christum crucifixum*, our whole lesson. By his nakednesse, learne to clothe thee; by his crowne of thornes, how to adorne thee; by his vinegre and gall, how to diet thee; by his praying for his murderer, how to reuenge thee; by his hanging on the crosse, how to repose thee. Heere learne, that death reuiueth, sorow solaceth, an ecclipsē enlighteneth; that out of the deuourer there came meat, and out of the stronger issueth sweetnesse. And since our sinnes (like fierce *Samsons*) haue murdered the lion of the tribe of Iuda, let our repentant thoughts (like bees) sucke at the flowers of his passion, and make hony to delight our selues and prouoke others. Let vs seeke Christ, not *inter cognatos & natos*, nor with the spouse in the Canticles, *in lectulo meo quæsui quem amavi*, nor with them in Osec, that looke him *in gregibus & armentis*; but seeke him with *Moses* in the desert, with *Daniel* in a firy throne. His delight is to see *Nineue* in sackcloth, *Job* on the dunghill; he expects a perfect demonstration of a seruiceable minde, for an *Eamus & nos, vt moriamur cum illo*: for losse of felicitie searcheth the force of affection. It is neither prosperitie that tries a friend, nor aduersitie that concealeth an enemie. This is that true God that chiefe life, in whom, by whom, and from whom all things doe flow, from whom to reuolt is to fall, to whom to returne is to rise, in whom to stay is to stand sure, from whom to depart is to die, to whom to repaire is to reuiue, in whom to dwell is to liue: that God whom none loseth but deceipted, none seeketh but admonished, none findeth but are cleansed, what euer is not of God is not good: giue me thy selfe, & take all things els from me.

CHAP. X.

A theme to thinke on.

Considera, ô homo, Quid es in natura, Quis in persona, Qualis in vita. Consider, ô man, what thou art in nature, who thou art in person, what an one thou art in life: for thou art not in nature as a stonc hauing onely being, nor as a plant hauing onely being and growing, nor as a brute hauing onely being, growing, and sense; but as a man who to these imperfections hath the perfection of a liuing soule added.

*This soul's a substance and a reall thing,
Which hath it selfe an actuall worke in night [i.e. working might],
But neither from the senses power doth spring,
Nor from the bodies humours tempered right:
It God himselfe doth in the bodie make,
And man from this the name of man doth take.*

10

And the same God that created thee of nothing, preserues thee from all things that might annoy thee; giues thee health and plentie, and subiecteth all things to thy seruice, that thou mightst serue him in holinesse and 15 righteousnesse all the dayes of thy life: for if God had not created thee, thou hadst not beene at all: if Christ had not redeemed thee, the diuell had dejected thee in the fall of *Adam*: if the Holy Ghost should not comfort thee, thou couldest not be preserued as thou art. Since therefore thou art Gods by creation, redemption, and preseruation, looke what time 20 thou bestowest out of his seruice, thou stealest it from him who made it for thee to serue him in it, and art a thiefe. If thou beest more enamoured of any of these blessings which he bestowes on thee to win thy loue, than of himselfe, who shewes his loue in bestowing them on thee, thou committest idolatrie, and art an idolater. If thou bestowest good houres in ill 25 actions, or great blessings to bad purposes, thou committest treason, and art a traitor.

*He that preferres not God fore all his race,
Amougst the sonnes of God deserves no place.*

Turpe est benè natis malè viuere, & plantatis benè peius fructificare. Thou 30 art created after his owne image; make no impression vnworthy that character. *Pulchra sint oportet que ex eius animo procedunt, qui in Dei habitaculum est preparandus.* Thy soule is the temple of the Holy Ghost, thou must not pollute it with brutish appetites, but prepare it with gracious meditations, most fitting food wherewithall to entertaine so heauenly 35 a ghest. He hath made thee in person erect, that he might put thee in mind to rectifie thy thoughts and actions. O leuell thy life to the straightnesse of the line of thine owne portraiture. Staine not the beautie of thy parts, lest thou sustaine miserie in this life with the losse of eternall life: for the stipend of sinne is death, and the merit of transgression is eternall 40 perdition.

CHAP. XIII.
[of STC 12408/9]

A Good Friday exercise, or a Meditation of the Crosse.

While I thinke of the Crosse of Christ, and bethinke my selfe of Christ crucified, I am so amazed with the amazement of so admirable a miracle, and so ouercome with the greatnessse of so mysticall a mysterie; as that the more I search what to finde, the lesse I finde what to say. I seeke for glorie, from the fountaine of glorie: but find miserie beyond humane miserie. 5 I expect gladnesse, as from the author of comfort: but finde sadnessse, such as my tongue cannot vtter. I looke for life, at the giuer of life: but finde death more deadly then any death. I come as a man to visit God: but finde God become the sonne of man, that men might become the sonnes of God. What I search, I cannot finde, what I finde, I cannot deliuer. For the 10 passion of Christ being compounded of so many forcible contraries, as of glorie, miserie, gladnes, sadnessse, life, death, God, man; the vnion of these contrarieties in one subiect is so effectuall, as it mooueth compassion; no passion can expresse it; for contraries to bee both predominant in one subiect, and for one subiect contendedly [i.e., contentedly] to containe 15 two predominant contraries, is a thing of that admiration, as that mans vnderstanding cannot comprehend, how the vnion of such disunion should be in communion. So that what part so euer of this whole you behold, you must loue the sweetnesse of this variety, and admire the varietie of this sweetnesse: Christ suffered vpon the Crosse, thats my griefe: Christ 20 suffered vpon the Crosse for mee, thats my comfort: Christ suffered death that I might know him man; Christ suffered death and arose againe in despight of death, that I might acknowledge him God. He suffered on the Crosse, thats the misery: Christ suffered to rise again, thats the glorie. It is a miracle beyond admiration, for miseric to containe glorie, for 25 death to bring forth life, for sadnessse to beget ioy. It is a trueth without distrust, that these flouds of sorrow and ioy, miserie, glorie, life, death, be vnitied in this Ocean of the passion, which thus ouerflowes the bounds of my vnderstanding. But it is nothing to say Christ suffered, vnlesse you know what he suffered. Great is the sorrow which a natural father 30 taketh of the wrong done to his sonne; great is the sorrow which a louing sonne taketh for the violence offered to his father: yet neither of these sorrowes are sorrowfull, in respect of that sorrow, which Christ suffered on the crosse, who in the obedience he ought to his father, became a sonne; and in in [i.e., in] the loue he beareth his children continues our father. 35

Consider and reconsider, the paine of *S. Paul* in his beheading, the sorrow of Saint *Peter* in his martyrdome, the grieuous pangs of death, that

Saint *Stephen* felt while he was stoned, view and reuiew, not the particular tormentes of seueral martyrs, but conceiue all their tortures to bee in one particular, yet doth not his sorrow equall the paine and sorrow which 40 the sonne of man redeemer of the world did suffer on the Crosse. For albeit the torment of particular dissingled [i.e., designed] martyres, was such as flesh and bloud could in no sort tollerate; yet did God in his mercie, so temper their punishmentes, either with power to contemne them, or patience to endure them, as if wee measure the ioy they conceiued of a 45 future life, with the paine and biting throwes which they abode while the soule sought his libertie to be let out of the bodie, wherein it was imprisioned; as it is questionable, whether their paine or pleasure were greater; but out of all question it is true, that there is such a mixture and equall temper, of paine with pleasure, and pleasure with paine, as it were not 50 of force to separate the soule from the bodie, were it not that God in his loue to requite their charitie, hath ordeined martyrdome, as a meanes for their glorious translation.

I speake not to amplifie, but to deliuer a trueth: for while Saint *Stephen* was stoned, the heauens were opened vnto him, and hee had the con- 55 templation of the ioyes thereof to mitigate his torment.

While *Agatha* her paps were cut off, shée had assistant vnto her the comfort of *Peter* the Physitian: and when Saint *Peter* was in prison, he had the consolation, and the presence of the Angell to shake open the doore, and vnboult his fetters. And so I might instance in the rest: but in the 60 passion of Christ there was such a confluxe of sorrow without pleasure, as it made so great an inundation as all the teares that mortalitie can shed, cannot possibly draw it.

It is no small augmentation of sorrow to thinke who it is that caused our grife; if an enemie wrong vs, the grife is the lesse, because it is ex- 65 pected; but if our friend iniurie vs, the grife is the greater, because that loue which should be nourished with kindnes, is quenched with discurtesie, the very oile that nourisheth hatred.

Now what were they that crucified Christ? they were not *Gentiles*, of whom he expected not to be acknowledged, but they were *Iewes* a 70 chosen Nation. They were not *Iewes* onely but one was *Iudas* a Disciple chosen, but an vnxpected traitour: if *Iudas* had betrayed him out of the malice of his own heart only, the grife had beeene lesse to the sonne, if the discurtesie had beeene tolerated by his heauenly father, neither did the father only suffer it, but the sonne consented to his owne punishmentes. 75

A Conspiracie, a strange conspiracie, of a Iewe turned a Gentile, of an Apostle turned an Apostata, suffered by the father to the sonne, by the sonne against himselfe, and all acting the death of an innocent lamb; acting

their parts, to impart a blessing to vs, that by his death we might haue our redemption: I haue stricken him, saith the father: I wil giue my life 80 for my flocke, saith the son. Crucifie him, Crucifie him, saith the Iewes: Pilate the Gentile condemned with his mouth, whom his heart knew to be innocent. The heauens consented, as desiring to haue hi[m] restored vnto them. The earth did second them, as hauing no other meanes of redemp-
tion: for their euils were against an infinite God, and infinite good- 85 nesse must satisfie for them.

Now what a griefe is it for the sonne to be smitten with the consent of his father, for the Lord to be derided of those whose redemption he was a ransoming, to suffer such great and grieuous punishments by his owne voluntarie approbations, what a griefe is it? he forbore to vse his owne 90 power in resisting these opprobries, in the time of his passion: not that he ought to do so, as suffering for his owne sinnes, being without sinne, but that he would doe so, in the fulnesse of his charitie, submitting himselfe to the mercie of those, who had not found mercie, but by his suffering: hee was rich aboue all, because God without sinne; poore aboue all, be- 95 cause man for our sinnes. To these adde the tendernes of the flesh, which did suffer; the contemptuous deriding world, for which hee suffered; the griefe of his disciples fleeing, because he suffered: adde all things, adde euerie thing, except you see all dolours of euerie martyr ouercommend and surpassed in this dolorous passion of our blessed Sauiour. 100

Thou seest not what the Crosse can teach thee, or Christ crucified doth giue thee to conceiue, words are wanting to expresse the greatnessse of this passion. His dolors were infinite, not to be numbred by art, or comprehended by mans apprehension; such and so vehement, as affected the heauens, the earth, the liuing, the dead, the sensible, and vnsensible 105 creatures; the Sunne was obscured, and the moone hid her selfe for shame, the earth trembled for feare, the monuments opened themselues, and the dead arose astonished; and what distraction of mind mans tongue cannot deliuer, Nature her selfe vnderooke to discouer: our griefe is from this sorrow; but our ioy is, that this sorrow and griefe was suffred for our 110 redemption.

Martyrdoine is a great mysterie. It is not that sowre, which the sense conceiueth, but it is that sweetnesse, which no sense conceits aright: for albeit; the habit of that death be vnnaturall, and it selfe contemptuous; yet to him that with the eie of vnderstanding, measures the effect by 115 the cause, there is nothing lesse in it, than that the worldly man seeth in it; they come not vnaarmed to this conflict, their brests are armed with the brest-plate of Justice. Their feete are shod so that they can walke on the basiliske and adder, as the Psalmist speaketh: their head is hid in the helmet

of saluation; they must die, before they can win the field: by yeeld- 120
ing, they subdue: by dying they reuiue: by shedding their blood, they win
the goale of eternall felicitie. Elias may not think much to let fall the
worthlesse mantle of his flesh, to be caried to paradise in a fiery chariot:
Ioseph must leaue his cloake in a strumpets hand, rather then yeeld to her
lude entisements. Beauers when they are hunted for their stones, bite 125
them off themselues, and runne home without them. Our home is heauen,
our parents the Patriarks. Wee must hasten to them without that wee
cannot without inconuenience carry with vs: there is the centre of our
repose, the seat of our securitie, and martyrdome is the bridge ouer which
wee passe to our contentment. 130

Sardanapalus lay not with more delight on his bed stopped with Millan
downe, than Saint *Laurence* lay on the cradle he was broiled on. Perfumed
Helen was not so sweet in all hir odoriferous balnes as was Saint *Cycily*
in the smoake of her martyrdome. But why do I glean in so plentifull a
haruest? Collect the coles, the wheeles, the ropes, the rakes, and all 135
the torments that tyrants haue inuented or martyrs suffered, and you shall
see the Crosse of Christ and meditation of the passion, to haue made those
torments delightfull to martyrs, that haue seemed vnsupportable to the
executioners themselues. A strange kinde of triumph, where the con-
querour is haled on the hirdle, with his handes manacled; his trium- 140
phant arche, the disgracefull gallowes; his spoiles and prizes, his vnbodyed
bowels; his pompe, punishment; his maisticie, miserie.

The Silkworme first eateth hir selfe out of a very little seed, and groweth
to bee a small worme: afterward when by feeding a certaine time vpon
fresh and greene leaues it is waxed of greater sise, eateth it selfe againe 145
out of the other coate, and worketh it selfe into a case of silke; which when
it hath once finished, in the end casting the seed for many yoong to breed
of, and leauing the silke for mans ornamant, dieth all white and winged,
in shape of a flying thing:

Euen so the martyrs of the Catholike Church, first breake out of 150
the dead seed of originall sinne by Baptisme: then, when by feeding on the
Sacraments and leaues of Gods word, they are growne to more ripenesse,
casting the coate of worldly vanities, they cloath themselues with the
silke of vertue & perfection of life, in which worke persecuting to the end,
euen when the persecution is greatest, they finally as need requireth, 155
shed their blood, as seed for new ofspring to arise of, and leauing moreouer
the silke of their vertues as an ornamant to the Church; and thus depart
white for their good works, and winged with innocencie of hands, and
cleannessse of heart, they presently flie to their heauenly repose, agreeably
to *Davids* saying, *Quis ascendet in montem domini? Innocens manibus &* 160

mundus corde: Who shall ascend to the mount of God? The innocent of hands, and cleane of heart. So that though the ripe fruit of the Church bee gathered, yet their blood engendreth new supply, and it increaseth the more, when the disincrease therof is violently procured. It is like the bush that burned and was not consumed. Of the own ruines it riseth, and 165 of the owne ashes it reuiueth, and by that increaseth, by which the world decayeth. For albeit *Constantine* refused a bath of the blood of Infants in age, yet doubtlesse had not these Infants in innocencie (I meane the Martyrs) bathed him in theirs, God knoweth whether euer hee had beeene rid of his spirituall leprosic: which he himselfe in a maner acknowl- 170 edging, when he came to that famous councell of *Nice*, finding many of those fathers, that had some part of their body maimed, or disfigured with the torments suffered for the Catholique faith, he embraced them in humble sort, most deuoutly kissing the scarres of their torments, as most honorable badges of Christianitic. The Crosse of Christ giues com- 175 fort to all those that repose themselues vnder it: Consider the tragicall pagent of Christes passion, wherein hee thus lost himselfe to winne vs: Behold his head full of thornes, his cares ful of blasphemies, his eyes full of teares, his mouth full of gall, his bodie full of wounds, his heart full of sorrow; no part free from paine, that all our parts might be freed of 180 paine. O worke without example, O grace without merit! O charitie surpassing all vnderstanding! O peccator, saith S. Bernard, *securum accessum habes ad patrem, vbi habes matrem ante filium, & filium ante patrem. Filius ostendit Patrilatus* [i.e., *Patri latus*], & *vulnera; Mater filio pectus & vbera: nec potest esse ibi aliqua repulsa, vbi sunt tot charitatis insignia:* O sinner, 185 securely maist thou come to the father, where thou hast the mother before the sonne, the sonne before his father. The sonne sheweth his father his side, and his woundes: the mother to her sonne her breast and her dugges: neither can there be any repulse, where there plead so many markes and tokens of charitie. 190

Behold thy Sauiour crucified vpon the crosse with his feet and hands fast nailed, satisfying for the remisnesse and loosenesse of thy behauour: Behold his painfull crowne of thornes vpon his head, satisfying for thy heady and imperious proceeding against thy brethren; Behold his sorrowfull and thristic exclamation, crying, *Sitio, I am drie, finding no* 195 *better refreshing than bitter gall, satisfying for thy gluttony: his cares loaded with reproch, satisfying for the delights thou tookest in flatterie.*

So that what good socuer wee are to expect, wee expect it from the infirmitie of the crosse, vnto which Christ submitted himselfe, leauing it vnto vs, as a Sacrament to cure vs, as a grace to strengthen vs, as a 200 merit to saue vs. O power! but a strange power, because out of miserie;

O strength! but a strange strength, because out of infirmitie; O life! but a strange life, because out of death: A mysteric, so great a mysterie, as I can not further expresse it, neither need I, for thou seest Christ hath done his part, in redeeming thee, there wanteth onely thy part, in being 205 thankefull for it; thou canst not be partaker of the fruites of his passion, except thou bee partner in the sorrows for his passion; Christ is gone before, and hath left vs his example, that wee might imitate him in humilitie, and austerity of life; except we impath our selues in the course of his passion, we shall not be partakers of his heauenly compassion. 210

EMENDATIONS

III, 71. annexed] aunaxed in *A*
III, 88. senza] seuza in all texts
III, 146. sementem] sementum in *AB*; corrected in *CD*
III, 148. sempiternus] sempeterius in *AB*; altered in *CD*
III, 19. ere] yer in *A*; yet in *B*; altered to ere in *CD*
III, 37. fickle] tickle in all but *D*, in which the alliteration seems to have been detected
V, 6. hath] haue in all texts
VII, 43. hee] be in *A*
X, 8. working might] work in night in *AB*; emendation supplied from *DC* and Englands Parnassus
XIII, 15. contentedly] contendedly in *C*; contentedly in *B* and *D*
XIII, 35. in] C alone in reading in in
XIII, 40. his] all texts read his; their inserted into a copy of *B* evidently by a reader who misunderstood the meaning
XIII, 184. Patri latus] patri latus in *B*; Patrilatus in *C*; emended to correct form in *D*

Note: Sig. D2 having been cropped in copy *A*, minor conjectural emendations have been made from VII, 35 to the end of VIII.

Hamlet: an Italian Source?

A. P. STABLER*

IN vol. xli, no. 2 (Winter, 1977) of the *Library Chronicle*, Theresa Suriano Ormsby-Lennon proposes a new possible source for the "closet" scene (*Hamlet* III.iv). Although the passage in question is of high intrinsic interest, as one more early witness to the perennial fascination of the Hamlet-story, with interesting "twists" of its own, I am not convinced that it is a likely source for Shakespeare's play, as I shall indicate in the following observations on Dr. Ormsby-Lennon's main points.

To provide a summary background for the discussion, we may recall that, in its main lines, the story of Hamlet goes back to the *Historia Danica* of the 12th-century Danish historian, Saxo Grammaticus. In 1572, François de Belleforest published an adaptation of Saxo's story, containing a number of additions and changes, in vol. 5 of his *Histoires tragiques*;¹ majority opinion now holds that it is upon this French adaptation that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is based.² Dr. Ormsby-Lennon's interesting revelation is that in 1561, the Italian author Remigio Nannini in his *Orationi in materia civile*³ published a summary of part of the Hamlet-story, including a version of Hamlet's "shending" of his mother. This passage, Dr. Ormsby-Lennon believes, is significantly closer in both stylistics and ideas to the Shakespearean version than is the corresponding text of Belleforest (the reader is referred to the article under discussion for such questions as the probabilities of Shakespeare's having seen Nannini's work and whether he could read Italian).

For her first main point, the author calls attention to a sentence in the Italian text, immediately following the blistering "shending" which Amleto (Hamlet) has just delivered to his mother: "Ricordati intanto di star cheta, e di tener secreto quel, ch'io ho fatto, e quel, ch'io ho detto, e s'io ho morto costui, l'ho morto giustamente, e cosi fosse stato il mio patrigno come egli è stato un suo consigliero." The author renders this as 'Remember, in the meantime, to keep quiet, and to hold secret, that which I have done and that which I

* Professor of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Washington State University.

have said, for if I have killed this man, I have killed him justly: would that it had been my stepfather in his own counsellor's place.' It is this last part of the sentence which is particularly interesting, for it conveys the idea of a substitution of the king for his counsellor—according to Dr. Ormsby-Lennon, in the form of a regret that the counsellor had not turned out to be the stepfather-king: Shakespeare's Hamlet is obviously disappointed that this was not the case ("is it the King?" and "I took thee for thy better"). The author, however, I feel, has mistranslated, or in any event taken liberties with, the Italian text here. Nannini's emphasis is on the *justness* of the killing of the counsellor, and the last part of the sentence explains *why* it was just, not expressing a regret that it was not the king who had been killed. The clause should be translated thus: ' . . . and if I have killed this man, I have killed him justly, and as if he had been my stepfather, even as he [Polonius] was his [Claudius's] counsellor.'⁴ To use the jargon of grammar, what we have here in Amleto's pluperfect subjunctive, is not an optative, but rather a past, contrary-to-fact condition—the idea of course being, that since the counsellor was the willing agent of the fratricidal king, the "proxy" execution was entirely just. The idea, then, of Hamlet's regret that Polonius had not turned out to be Claudius, will have to be credited to Shakespeare himself.⁵

The author's second main point has to do with the nature and psychodynamics of the Queen's "sin"; why does she, indeed, "post / With such dexterity to incestuous sheets"? Saxo, the first to record Hamlet's harangue to his mother, has him accuse her of wantoning like a harlot; of entering into an incestuous marriage; of acting like brute beasts, such as the mares that hasten to copulate with the vanquishers of their first mates; and of having forgotten her first husband. Belleforest repeats all of this, and uses words like 'lasciviousness,' 'shamelessness,' 'unbridled desires,' and concludes that 'it is lubricity alone which has erased in your mind the valiances and virtues of the good King. . . .'⁶ Nannini, who, as Dr. Ormsby-Lennon repeatedly observes, is much more terse than Belleforest, says approximately the same things as does Saxo (his source), including reference to the faithless and promiscuous mares who hasten to mate with the murderers of their first husbands, all of which, he says, shows that 'you have erased from your memory the love and affec-

tion of your first husband.' Thus, Saxo and Belleforest say, in effect, that lasciviousness has caused the Queen to forget the virtues and love of her first husband; Nannini has, according to the author, a radically differing explanation of Gertrude's behavior, and says that a "self-willed moral amnesia" on her part has produced her faithlessness and lasciviousness (i.e. a reversal of cause and effect as given by Saxo-Belleforest). Her sin, in sum, is forgetfulness, and, says Dr. Ormsby-Lennon, this is what Shakespeare also emphasizes. Here I confess to considerable puzzlement, for repeated scrutiny of Shakespeare's "closet" scene has failed to turn up a single reference to the "memory" motif in connection with the Queen. As the author points out, Shakespeare's Hamlet accuses his mother of most of the things Saxo and Belleforest have him do, perhaps of general moral anarchy as well,⁷ and specifically of poor esthetic judgment, in leaving the "wholesome brother," the "fair mountain . . . to feed / And batten on this moor." "Have you eyes?" he twice rhetorically asks. The author then says, "Interpreting the Queen's behavior in the light of her inability to perceive moral problems, one sees that it is a self-willed amnesia which has blunted Gertrude's faculties. . . ." The "one" who sees this, I think, must be the author, because there appears to be nothing to indicate that Shakespeare interprets Gertrude's behavior as a deliberate stifling of the memory.

Thirdly: in his "argomento" or preface, Nannini says "Trouandosi Amleto a questa foggia serrato e bramando di mostrar alla madre, che non era pazzo, cominciò a dubitare, che quiui non fosse alcuno, che lo sentisse . . ." ('Hamlet finding himself thus closeted and yearning to show his mother that he was not mad, began to suspect that there might be someone there who was eavesdropping'). This longing to confide in his mother, says the author, which is not expressed in either Saxo or Belleforest, suggests the "ambivalence of thought and feeling which characterizes all of [Shakespeare's] Hamlet's dealings with his mother. . . ."⁸ Here, as in general with the "contributions" proposed from divers authors to *Hamlet*, my response is first, that some leeway has to be left for Shakespeare's own contributions to the psychology of his characters, and secondly, that if hints are required there were sufficient in Belleforest for all the features in question. In the present instance, for example, Belleforest shows Hamlet asking his mother's pardon for speaking so harshly to her

(“cruel only to be kind”), and later accepting her explanation of her behavior and accepting her as an ally—even though he had at first suspected her of being in on the eavesdropping plot!⁹—certainly enough to suggest ambivalent feelings.

Dr. Ormsby-Lennon’s fourth point again involves a translation, or interpretation of Nannini’s text which I am unable to accept. The Italian text reads: “Ma egli non m’uscirà delle mani, e l’amazzerò in ogni modo, e farò, che conoscerà, che questa mia pazzia sarà, stata una cattiva pazzia per lui” (“Yet he will not escape from my hands, and I will murder him in any way possible, and I will accomplish this in such a way that he will recognize that my madness has been a very bad one for him.”) The author says that “there is an ambiguity of expression in the Italian which gives one pause: as it stands, the last part of the sentence can mean either (a) the King will have recognized my madness as deleterious to both his health and crown or (b) the King will have understood that my seemingly irrational behavior was designed to drive him mad.”¹⁰ Although in the ensuing discussion the author assumes this latter interpretation as proven, there is absolutely nothing in the Italian text which can plausibly be construed as any threat on the part of Amleto to drive his stepfather mad.

Finally, the author says “the best argument for Shakespeare’s knowledge of Nannini can be found in the poet’s own work,” and goes on to contrast Shakespeare’s “provocative economy of statement . . . simplicity and vigor of rhythm” with Belleforest’s “rampant verbosity and moralistic observation,” as well as his many other stylistic and esthetic defects. Nannini, she says (occasionally) has a greater “conceptual maturity in his style” (than Belleforest), and consequently is a better source for Shakespeare.¹¹ One could accept this observation as useful, if there did not exist convincing proof that the defects of Belleforest’s style had no terrors for Shakespeare (or the author of the *Ur-Hamlet*, whoever he may have been), as is shown in the many Belleforest (non-Saxo) items, including several turns of phrase, which have survived through all the successive phases of *Hamlet* —the *Ur-Hamlet*, *Fratricide Punished*, the supposed “first-draft” of Shakespeare, Q1 and Q2.¹² Again, there is no convincing proof, or even any plausible indication, that any version of the Hamlet-story other than that of Belleforest, made a direct contribution to Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*.

NOTES

1. The most convenient place to refer to both Saxo's and Belleforest's versions of the Hamlet-story, is in Sir Israel Gollancz's *The Sources of Hamlet* . . . (London, 1926).
2. See for example Geoffrey Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare* (London, 1957-), vii, 15.
3. (Venice: G. Giolito de' Ferrari, 1561); see Dr. Ormsby-Lennon's footnote 2 for credits on the discovery. Translations in the text from Nannini into English (except for those identified as mine) are Dr. Ormsby-Lennon's.
4. Claudius and Polonius were first so named by Shakespeare in *Q2*; in Saxo the fratricidal king was Fengo (Fengon in Belleforest), and the counsellor was unnamed.
5. The structure and idea of this sentence of Nannini's ' . . . if I have killed this man, I have killed him justly, and as if he had been my stepfather . . .' [my translation] rather closely resemble those of Belleforest's text (Gollancz, op. cit., p. 224): "Mais quand bien j'auray dressé la main contre Fengon, ce ne sera trahison ny felonnie . . . : ains justement le puniray . . ." ('But if I should raise my hand against Feng, it will be neither treason nor felony . . . : rather justly shall I punish him . . .'). As Dr. Ormsby-Lennon points out (op. cit. pp. 134-135) it is known that Belleforest knew Nannini's work, and may well have borrowed this emphasis on the just punishment or killing from the Italian writer. It should be pointed out, however, that if Belleforest owes anything to Nannini, by the same token the necessity for Shakespeare to have used the latter is diminished. We may also notice that the idea of the just punishment of the King continues on into Shakespeare (*Q1* and *Q2*): as Claudius dies, Laertes exclaims "He is justly served . . ." (V.ii).
6. Gollancz, p. 212.
7. Ormsby-Lennon, op. cit., p. 135.
8. Ormsby-Lennon, op. cit., p. 139. The translation is mine.
9. Gollancz, pp. 208, 210.
10. Ormsby-Lennon, op. cit., p. 129.
11. Ormsby-Lennon, op. cit., p. 141.
12. I have discussed Belleforest's contributions to *Hamlet* in a number of articles, of which the two most useful for the present discussion were published in *Shakespeare Studies*: "The Source of the German *Hamlet*," *ShakS*, 5 (1969), 97-105; and "More on the Search for Yorick's Skull," *ShakS*, 7 (1974), 203-208.

William Musgrave and John Reynolds's *Mela*

J. D. ALSOP*

IN 1711 the Anglican cleric and schoolmaster John Reynolds published his edition of *Pomponii Melae De situ orbis libri tres*, one of the most successful and popular eighteenth-century geographical texts. New insights into Reynolds and the publication of this classical work are provided in a hitherto unknown letter of 1708 from Dr. William Musgrave to Charles Spencer, third Earl of Sunderland. Musgrave (1655?–1721) was a prominent physician and antiquary who, after studying at Oxford and Leyden, was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1684, subsequently served as editor and a contributor to the *Philosophical Transactions*, and in 1692 was elected a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians. He was an important early scholar of Roman Britain, contributing numerous publications to this field of research.¹ In 1691 he settled at Exeter and this, as can be seen from his letter, brought him into contact with Reynolds. Reynolds's father, John Reynolds, senior (d. 1692), had been a canon of Exeter, vicar of St. Thomas the Apostle in the city, and headmaster of Exeter Grammar School.² Following a distinguished scholastic career at Eton and King's College, Cambridge, the younger Reynolds returned to Exeter in 1694 to become master of the city's free school. He subsequently took his Cambridge M.A. in 1698, an Oxford B.D. in 1718, and followed his father as master of the Grammar School from 1713 until 1743.³ On April 21, 1708, Musgrave wrote from Exeter to the Earl of Sunderland, then secretary of state for the southern department, requesting patronage for Reynolds and citing the forthcoming edition of *De situ orbis* as evidence of his scholarly ability and worth. This letter provides an important early reference to Reynolds's work on this classical text, with an enthusiastic appraisal of it by a scholar of Roman Britain. Moreover, it includes new information on Reynolds's circumstances at this time and his efforts to secure preferment in the church which are directly

* Fellow of the University of Wales, Department of History, University College of North Wales.

relevant to his edition of *De situ orbis*. Therefore, it is worthwhile to quote from the letter at length:⁴

Will yor Lord^p permit me to address you, in behalf of a very learned, & a very Good Man: There is (my Lord!) in my neighborhoōd, in Exeter, a Scholemaster, Mr Reynolds; who, being Bred up under Dr Roderic at Eaton,⁵ is becom a Master of as much Antient, especially Critical & Geographical Learning, as perhaps any Man, now living, has acquired: however, being (for reasons not at all to his dishonor) neglected by the Disposers of or Church-Preferments, & having a Numerous ffamily, is, tho his School be advantageous to Him, partly from ye largness of his ffamily, but cheifly from his great worth, becom an Object of Compassion.

There is (my Lord!) at a little distance from this City, a little Vicarige, cald Brantford-Speke, now vacant, and in the Gift of my Lord Chancellor: Could this Honest, Learned Man obtain this Small Vicarige; tho not worth above 60, or at most 70^{lb} per annum; He would think Hinsel Happy, as a Bishop. A word, or a Message, from yor Lord^p, to my Lord Chancellor, (if your Lord^p would Condescend so far as to move in this matter) would secure this little place to this poor learned Man, & make Him and his Six Children easy.

My Lord! There is one particular, w^{ch} makes me more than ordinary, Sollicitous in this Affair. Mr Reynolds is goeing to Publish an edition of Mela; w^{ch} is so full of good Literature & adornd wth such accurate Maps, as will render his Edition vastly preferable to that of Gronovius,⁶ or even that of Vossius.⁷ Nothing is wanting, to Recomend this excellent work to ye Public; but the name of some great Patron, prefixt to it: The Thing, I have now mentiond, will give a good Occasion for, & be in some measure a Justification of such a Dedication; & I should be most glad, to see this Book appear Inscribd to the Earl of Sunderland.

Musgrave was apparently already acquainted with Sunderland,⁸ and as a secretary of state the earl was in a position to assist Reynolds. Sunderland had acquired a reputation as a noted bibliophile and patron of scholarship, and presumably Musgrave and Reynolds had taken this into account when they suggested that the work be dedicated to Sunderland. However, this was not to be. Reynolds was not appointed to the vicarage, and when *De situ orbis* was published in 1711 it was not dedicated to Sunderland. Indeed, the edition had no dedication and did not even contain Reynolds's name.⁹ Reynolds had to wait for preferment in the church until 1729 when he became a prebendary of Exeter. Later appointed a canon of Exeter, from

1733 until his death he was a distinguished fellow of Eton College and prominent classicist.¹⁰ Although Musgrave's letter did not fulfill its purpose, it survives to provide evidence on Reynolds and his scholarship. Apparently, the edition of Mela was all but complete in April 1708, three years before it was published. Musgrave, although he was obviously biased, clearly thought very highly of both the work and its editor. This relationship between these two classical scholars deserves recognition.

NOTES

1. *Dictionary of National Biography*.
2. Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses, 1500-1714* (1968 reprint), III, 1248.
3. Ibid.; John Venn and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (Cambridge, 1922), I, iii, 445.
4. This letter survives among Sunderland's personal papers. Formerly Blenheim Palace C 1/39 (unfoliated), it is now in the British Library, Additional MS. 61,612, fols. 54-55. The letter is published by kind permission of the British Library.
5. Charles Roderick, D.D. (d. 1712), had also attended King's College, Cambridge. From 1682 until 1689 he was headmaster of Eton, and ended his career as Dean of Ely. Venn, I, iii, 477.
6. Jacobus Gronovius (1645-1716).
7. Isaac Vossius (1618-1689).
8. Although William Musgrave merely signed the letter with his name, he was sufficiently well known for Sunderland or his clerk to endorse the letter "Dr Musgrave."
9. It was only with the second edition of 1739 that Reynolds placed his name on the work. This edition, as well, contained no dedication.
10. *The Eton College Register, 1698-1752*, ed. R. A. Austen Leigh (Eton, 1927); H. C. Maxwell Lyte, *A History of Eton College, 1440-1884* (London, 1889), p. 293.

Revisions in the Published Texts of Volume One of Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa*

WILLIAM B. WARDE, JR.*

THE publication of the first edition of Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa* in seven volumes was possible only after some deletions had been made and seven-eighths of volume six and all of volume seven had been printed in small type.¹ The number of deletions from the manuscript in order to keep the text within seven volumes is difficult to ascertain; the problem is compounded by the addition of some two hundred pages to the third edition, the major portion of which appears in a separately published volume, *Letters and Passages Restored* (1751), in order to bring the first and second editions up to date. In an important study of this problem, M. Kinkead-Weekes analyzes several of the notes and additions as they emphasize the novel's didacticism, Clarissa's "delicate" character, and the depravity of Lovelace. Concerning the new passages, he concludes that

It would then seem reasonable to assume that most of the new passages are not restorations at all, but changes designed to counteract a serious misreading. This receives some support as far as the second edition is concerned from an apparently unnoticed document in the Forster Collection (Forster, xv. 2, fols. 43-44).² It is a checklist of the variants between the first and second editions; and though it must have been compiled when Richardson was preparing his volume of 'Letters and Passages Restored', it does not speak of 'restorations', but of 'alteration', 'addition', 'insertion', and 'emendation'.³

T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel conclude that there are some additions to the second edition which probably are restorations but that only three additions to the third edition definitely seem to be "restorations from the original version."⁴ Richardson's concern does not, then, abate with the completion of the publication of the first edition but takes another bearing; he no longer has any serious

* Associate Professor of English, North Texas State University.

qualms concerning length, but directs his energies toward revision and new editions.

In the following study I will attempt to summarize and investigate the history of the textual changes in the first volume as it appeared in the first edition (1747-1748), the second edition (1749), the third edition and the fourth edition (published simultaneously, 1751), another "fourth" edition (1759),⁵ the posthumous fifth edition (1764), and another posthumous edition (1792), with a title page reading, "A NEW EDITION WITH THE LAST CORRECTIONS BY THE AUTHOR."⁶ This study is based on my own collation of the *first* volume of *Clarissa*.⁷ *Letters and Passages Restored* and relevant passages from literary studies, such as those by Eaves and Kimpel and Kinkead-Weekes, and from Richardson's correspondence will be referred to when they clarify or indicate significant conclusions concerning the changes. Major changes are identified as those which substantially reflect Richardson's conscious concern with the psychology of his characters, including the clarity of their presentation, and the dramatic effectiveness of his novel. All changes, of course, underscore his conclusions concerning artistic practice and his high moral purpose.

The extent of Richardson's influence on the 1792 edition, published thirty-one years after his death, is impossible to ascertain. Richardson's daughter Anne had written to her sister Martha Bridgen concerning proposals for a new edition shortly after 1780⁸ and again on April 12, 1792, to her niece Mrs. Moodie, with whom she discussed revisions in the text of *Clarissa*. Mrs. Moodie seemingly was involved with the publication of the 1792 edition, perhaps inheriting from her mother a copy of *Clarissa* with revisions by Richardson. Richardson wrote on April 9, 1755, to Mary Shewrin Watts:

I have told our good brother Jeronymo the reason why I am sollicitous to have the faults in my printed writings marked by my kind friends. It is this: I have laid by a copy of each, with such corrections in them as my friends, or my own reperusal, have suggested to me, in case, after my demise, new editions should be called for: and as anything of this sort occurs, I put it down in its proper place. . . .⁹

Thus an altered copy would have been possible, as the title page of the 1792 edition denotes. I have examined a copy of Lady Brad-

shaigh's marginalia made by Eaves and Kimpel,¹⁰ and there is only one passage in this volume that I believe could possibly have had any influence on the 1792 edition. This edition does contain minor alterations of the sort made by Richardson in earlier editions. However, they could be by Richardson, or they could be by Anne, or they could be by almost anybody.

A study of the changes in volume one readily yields evidence of the painstaking care that Richardson took to make his novel correct. Minute concern is manifest in the fact that Richardson makes a single-word change five hundred and twenty-six times¹¹ in one volume alone in the second edition. For example, he is careful to have his characters refer to parents in more connotatively objective and socially proper forms and to avoid fond, personal forms. He changes "mamma" to "Mother" one hundred and eighty-six times and "papa" to "Father" one hundred and thirty-nine times.

In keeping with the tone of the situations and the characters involved, the intimations of titular respect associated with the words "lady" and "gentleman" are eliminated by substituting the words "woman" four times and "man" five times, respectively. Eaves and Kimpel state that this type of substitution is "the same sort of change which Richardson had made in successive editions of *Pamela* and shows his desire to write in a way worthy of his new characters, who were decidedly above him in class" (*A Biography*, p. 311). The remaining one hundred and ninety-one changes in diction range throughout the various parts of speech: for example, the past participle in the following, "his hands folded" to "his hands clasped" (B viii 48) and the noun "library" to "closet" (B xvi 97).

That Richardson has solved most of his problems about diction in the second edition is evidenced by the fact that he makes only fifty-four such changes in the third edition. Reasons for some of the changes, such as propriety, can often be deduced, but most reflect apparently arbitrary choices such as in the change from "per annum" to "a year" (C ii 6) and "proclaims" to "avows" (C xliv 310). Some of the changes are difficult to label. Richardson, for example, changes a plural to a singular when Clarissa speaks of Arabella's having all of Lovelace's "reverence" (C iii 17) rather than his "reverences" (A iii 17).

Of the minor changes, collectively, however, a generalization is

possible: there is a tendency to elevate the style and to make the novel more "correct." There are, for instance, eliminations of thirty-two contractions in the second edition, most merely routine, and Richardson carefully eliminates the grammatically undesirable preposition at the end of a sentence eleven times in the second edition. There is only one instance of moving the preposition from the end of a clause in the third edition and no instance of submitting a noun-reference for a pronoun.

Of the remainder of the minor changes, there are, first, about eighty-five clearly identifiable instances of general revision in the second edition which involve approximately the same number of words. A frequent general revision involves shifting the syntax in order to improve the rhetoric or emphasis. Second, of approximately one hundred deletions in the second edition, most improve sentences by eliminating wordiness and repetition, such as when Clarissa tells Anna Howe of the effect of love: "For Love . . . laid a generous mind under the hard necessity of obligation and dependence" (A xxviii 180) becomes "For Love . . . laid a generous mind under obligation and dependence" (B xxviii 181). Finally, there are about eighty minor additions to the second edition, with word and phrase additions frequently improving clarity and directness.

By the third edition Richardson had so reworked his novel that he found occasion for only a few minor changes: fifteen general revisions, twenty-three deletions, and twenty-two additions with no added footnotes. None of the revisions involve more than a few words. The forty-five minor additions and deletions also involve only a few words and are similar in pattern to those Richardson made in the second edition. The longest change is a ten-word addition occurring as Clarissa relates to Anna Howe the family problems that have resulted from her mother's over-indulgence:

Our flatterers will tell us any thing sooner than our faults.

(A v 30)

Our flatterers will tell us anything sooner than our faults, or what they know we do not like to hear.

(C v 31)

Study of the collation itself, then, indicates Richardson's minute concern with making his novel correct from several technical points of view.

However, concern with psychological depth of character and dramatic progression and intensity share equally Richardson's attention and require more detailed analysis and explanation. In this volume the most notable major changes of this nature appear in the second edition. There are about fifteen obvious instances of improving or clarifying Clarissa's character and consequent motivation, one instance of improving Hickman's character, and two each of darkening Arabella's and Lovelace's; the dramatic quality is improved in at least a dozen places.

Early in the novel Richardson simplifies a passage in one of Clarissa's letters and deletes a rather histrionic, rhetorical repetition in order to show more clearly Clarissa's perception of Lovelace's arrogance:

In short, he seems to me so to behave, when most unguarded, as if he thought himself above the very politeness which his birth and education (perhaps therefore more than his choice) oblige him to shew. In other words, his very politeness appears to me to be constrained. . . .

(A xi 64)

In short, his very Politeness, notwithstanding the advantages he must have had from his birth and education, appears to me to be constrained. . . .

(B xi 64)

In this volume there are five other obvious examples of deletion of material in order to make Clarissa's character more positive. For example, when Clarissa dramatically enters a room to entreat her mother for a private audience, Richardson deletes Clarissa's reflective comment concerning her own awareness and a possible indecisiveness: "I enter'd like a dejected criminal, I believe;—and besought" (A xxi 140) is improved to read "I entered like a dejected criminal; and besought" (B xxi 141).

Richardson deletes a passage in which Clarissa gives Anna Howe the reason why she cannot be dutiful and tells of begging her mother to save her from marrying Solmes. The harshness of diction or even of idea is not proper to Clarissa's delicacy:

as it (Clarissa's marrying Solmes) would demonstrate less of duty then of a slavish, and even of a sordid mind, seeking to preserve its worldly fortunes, by the sacrifice of its future happiness. . . .

(A xx 136)

Just as this reason for marrying Solmes is cut in a letter from Clarissa to her Uncle Antony, Richardson has deleted a sentence which might be construed to indicate a conscious preference by Clarissa for Lovelace:

And is it such a crime in me, if I *should* prefer an acquaintance of Twelve months to one of Two?—

(A xxxii 209)

While Richardson is careful not to present too strongly Lovelace's attraction for Clarissa, Lovelace's sophistication and Clarissa's relative youth and innocence make it unlikely that she would be unduly harsh toward him. Consequently, Richardson saw fit to soften slightly Clarissa's early attitude toward Lovelace by not having her refer to him as "the man so hated" (A xx 137). Using the correct address, "Mr. Lovelace," here makes it possible for Richardson to maintain a more formal distance between these two characters.

There are three instances of amplification and addition affecting, both psychologically and dramatically, the love relationship between Clarissa and her suitors especially as these parallel the situation of Mrs. Harlowe and her husband. In an addition, Clarissa tells Anna Howe, "My Mother, my dear, tho' I must not say so, was not obliged to marry against *her* liking. My Mother loved my Father" (B xvii 109). In one of four major additions to volume one, also included in *Letters and Passages Restored*, Richardson adds three paragraphs in which Clarissa further reveals her love for her mother. She explains how a combination of her mother's excessive love and her father's malady resulted in meekness in the former and an inability in the latter to bear any contradiction:

—And if so, was it not too natural [human nature is not perfect, my dear] that the Husband thus humoured by the wife, should be unable to bear controul from any-body else? much less contradiction from his children?

(B xxviii 180)

Clarissa's brother and sister reflect more antipathy toward Lovelace as Richardson changes Clarissa's statement to Anna Howe about their "implacableness to Mr. Lovelace" (A xiii 72) to "antipathy to Mr. Lovelace" (B xiii 72). In contrast to this antipathy, Clarissa innocently sees more of the potential good in Lovelace, as the following addition indicates:

Nor is it a very bad indication, that he has such moderate notions of that very high Prerogative in Husbands, of which we in our family have been accustomed to hear so much.

(B xxxvi 243)

These additions concerning Clarissa's family are important because they set the scene for the intense family struggle without which Clarissa would not have turned to Lovelace. Austin Dobson, for example, concludes that

Clarissa does not admire Lovelace, whose past reputation is repugnant to her; but the march of circumstances, and the persistent way in which, both by himself and by her family, he is kept before her mind, gradually result in her taking—to say the least—an interest in him.¹²

Richardson takes great care, even to concerning himself with single words, that the reader should understand Clarissa's mentality. For example, her decisiveness is underlined when Richardson changes "I must beg or seek the occasion" (A xiv 85) to "I must take or seek the occasion" (B xiv 85), and her simplicity is stressed as he changes a reference to herself as "an ingenuous mind" (A xxxviii 256) simply to an "I" (B xxxviii 257).

Richardson also revises so that discussions or descriptions of Clarissa are not related by herself but rather by some other person, thus preserving her humility. In at least three such changes, it would be presumptuous of Clarissa to speak in this manner of herself. For example, not only probability but also dramatic intensity is gained as Mrs. Harlowe describes her daughter's obedience in a speech which begins "Yes, Clary, I cannot but say that you have hitherto behaved extremely well" (B xvii 106) rather than "Yes, she was pleased to say, I had behaved extremely well" (A xvii 106).

Though Hickman plays only a minor role in volume one, he does come in for one small improvement in the reader's eyes as Richardson deletes a passage in which Anna Howe describes him to Clarissa as formal and antiquated:

For Hickman appears to me to be a man of that antiquated cut; as to his mind I mean: A great deal too much upon the formal, you must needs think him to be, yourself.

(A xxvii 174)

Lovelace, on the other hand, is presented so that his evil nature is

set into plainer view; Richardson will emphasize this element of Lovelace's character more in consecutive volumes. There is both further delineation of character and increased stress on motivation as Richardson enlarges and revises a paragraph dealing with Arabella, Lovelace, and Solmes in a letter from Anna Howe to Clarissa; the following four lines constitute the single largest addition:

Your whole family likewise avowedly attached to the odious man (Solmes) by means of the captivating proposals he has made them—When I consider all these things, I am full of apprehensions for you.—

(B xv 89)

Throughout this letter, Arabella's motives and her anger at Clarissa are emphasized. Her motives are now stimulated "by disappointed *Love*, and actuated by *Revenge*—" (B xv 88) whereas previously they were stimulated "by disappointed love and revenge—" (A xv 88).

Much of the above discussion has touched with little comment on the dramatic quality of this novel; although the dramatic improvements in volume one are not so evident as are those in the presentation of character, intensity is heightened in the second edition in the delineation of the mental and physical relationships of the characters. For example, as Lovelace refuses to leave the Harlowe residence and attempts to force Clarissa's uncles to ask his pardon, Richardson intensifies the family struggle throughout the passage, especially by the following change:

A door being also held fast lock'd between them; my mamma struggling with my papa. . . .

(A iv 26)

A door being held fast locked between him and them. My Mother all the time was praying and struggling to withhold my Father in the great parlour.

(B iv 26)

There are a dozen or more minor instances of heightening the dramatic situation, such as the addition of an exhortation by Mr. Harlowe to Clarissa—"remember that, girl!" (B xxxii 216), and a few instances of changing person for dramatic as well as psychological effect, as discussed earlier.

For substantial changes the discussion must now turn to the third edition in which there are four additions and revisions, three appearing in *Letters and Passages Restored* which constitute the only major additions to the first volume. Psychological interplay between Clarissa and her brother and realism are heightened as a letter from Clarissa to James is presented in full rather than in summary. A parallel change—a revision adding six lines which do not appear in *Letters and Passages Restored*—heightens the dramatic tension between Arabella and Clarissa, revealing also the cruelty of Arabella and the despair of Clarissa. Richardson is concerned with consistency of character and, though seeing Arabella as cruel and unthinking, deletes a section revealing an improbable, exaggerated flippancy when Clarissa asks her to deliver a letter to her brother:

Pr'ythee, pr'ythee, take it back; and put it to thy love-sick heart, and never think I will be laughed at for being *taken-in* by thy whining nonsense. I know thee better, my dear.—And, with another spiteful laugh, she flung it on my toilette; and away she went.—Contempts for contempts, as she passed!—That's for your *poor Bella's*!

(A xlii 296)

Since Richardson deletes this passage, the seriousness of the situation is made more obvious as Arabella now more humbly agrees to serve as a messenger.

Clarissa's hope for a way out of her dilemma is underscored as Richardson adds an eight-page letter. In this dramatic letter, Clarissa, writing to Anna Howe, assumes that her proposal must have been accepted; and in a striking revelation of personality, she imaginatively recreates and visualizes the whole scene, step by step, from the time of the arrival of the relatives:

And now [as any-thing stirred] is my Sister coming to declare the issue of all! Tears gushing again, my heart fluttering as a bird against its wires; drying my eyes again and again to no purpose.

(C xliii 303)

Clarissa's positive assumption and consequent imaginings serve as strong dramatic contrast when the vision is ended by Arabella's impudent report that Mr. Harlowe is unyielding. Clarissa, recovering from the initial shock, begins to regain her composure, ceases to

argue with Arabella, commands the situation, and shows herself as noble in stature:

You are but my Sister: My Brother is not my Sovereign. And while I have a Father and Mother living, I will not be thus treated by a Brother and Sister, and their servants, all setting upon me, as it should seem, to make me desperate, and to do a rash thing.—I will know, in short, Sister Bella, *why I am to be constrained thus?*—What is intended by it?—And whether I am to be considered as a *child* or a *slave*?

(C xlili 307)

Even Arabella is affected and temporarily submissive: “She stood aghast all this time, partly with real, partly with affected surprize” (C xlili 307). Clarissa continues the letter at noon, still waiting anxiously for any report as to what is to be done with her. She indicates that she has just received a letter full of vows and entreaties from Lovelace and unconsciously reveals an attraction to him. Hilles, regarding the first two volumes as a structural unit, traces the increasing involvement of Clarissa with Lovelace in the first volume and views the conclusion of this letter as

one of the few effective additions (or “restorations”), first printed in the third edition. A prisoner in her own home, terrified by her family’s threats of sending her to Uncle Antony’s moated grange, she suddenly bursts out: . . . “But what shall I do with this Lovelace? . . . such protestations of inviolable faith and honour; such vows of reformation; such pressing arguments to escape from this disgraceful confinement—O my Nancy, what shall I do with this Lovelace?”

(C xciii 309)¹³

It is logical that this letter is directed to Anna Howe, since she is the primary means by which the readers learn that Clarissa is attracted to Lovelace.

In the 1792 edition the changes in volume one number well over two hundred and are the types of changes that will occur throughout the eight volumes. For example, the word “further” (A xl 275, xli 281) is changed to “farther” (F xl 277, xli 283) and “you was” (A xxv 160, xxxiii 224) to “you were” (F xxv 161, xxxiii 226) two times each and “Kinsman” (B xxvi 165) to “Relation” (F xxvi 166) and “Papa” (C xlili 309) to “Father” (F xlili 309) once each. The three largest changes constitute only the deletion of about ten lines

of any importance, and it is possible that some deletions were typesetting errors. One change is merely the deletion of two lines in a description of Lovelace's prospects reported by Uncle Antony after he heard them from Lovelace's half sisters.

In summary, the care with which Richardson altered and continued to revise *Clarissa* during his lifetime is clearly manifest in the number of changes he made in volume one in order to improve the correctness of his novel as much as possible. The early volumes, especially volume one and portions of volume two, were given intense attention by Richardson, who undoubtedly recognized the importance of setting clearly in the exposition the tone, character, and theme. While study of the collation clearly indicates Richardson's concern with making his novel correct from several technical points of view, character and dramatic progression and intensity were equally significant concerns of Richardson. Though it is true that Richardson sometimes subjects his audience to unnecessary amplification in order to make certain that his readers receive the correct impression, he made his changes only after careful forethought, and it is my opinion that the changes as a whole do improve the overall quality. Furthermore, I believe that Richardson's changes result in more clearly and fully developed characterizations and more detailed and emphatic presentation of his themes as well as improvement in the dramatic quality of *Clarissa*, a most carefully wrought product of Richardson's intense artistic integrity.

NOTES

1. See William Merritt Sale, Jr., *Samuel Richardson, a Bibliographical Record* (New Haven, 1936). Sale discusses in detail the history of the publication of the first through two "fourth" editions and *Letters and Passages Restored*.
2. Pointed brackets are used to add necessary footnote information and commentary to quotations of critics and editors and to distinguish my comments from those often made by Richardson within square brackets.
3. M. Kinkead-Weekes, "Clarissa Restored?" *RES*, n.s., 10 (1959), 157.
4. Duncan Eaves and Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson: a Biography* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 310, 315. Hereafter cited as *A Biography*.
5. See Sale. All editions and *Letters and Passages Restored* are in duodecimo except the 1751 edition, which is in octavo. The fifth and the 1792 editions, not listed by Sale, are in duodecimo.

6. Location of copies used: first edition, University of Arkansas; second and third editions, owned by T. C. Duncan Eaves; fourth edition, octavo, University of Arkansas; fourth edition, duodecimo, University of Illinois; fifth edition, owned by T. C. Duncan Eaves; 1792 edition, Southern Methodist University; *Letters and Passages Restored*, owned by T. C. Duncan Eaves.
7. All of the passages will be identified by the letter number (in volume 1) in small Roman numerals and the page numbers in Arabic numerals; the editions will be indicated by capital letters, A being the first edition, B the second C the third, and F the 1792, corresponding in letter with the idea that, if the publication had been labelled as to edition, it would have been a sixth edition.
8. Alan Dugald McKillop, *Samuel Richardson, Printer and Novelist* (Chapel Hill, 1936), p. 284.
9. *Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson*, ed. John Carroll (Oxford, 1964), p. 225. Hereafter cited as *Letters*. Carroll erroneously dates the letter 1753 and identifies the addressee as Hester Mulso. The correct addressee and date are given by Eaves and Kimpel in *A Biography*, p. 681.
10. See *A Biography*, p. 234. Lady Bradshaigh's edition of *Clarissa* was owned by the late Commander Arthur Avalon MacKinnon of MacKinnon.
11. Changes such as the following are considered as single changes: "she is full of fears" (A v 30) to "she is very fearful" (B v 30) and "unbrotherly nephew" (A ix 51) to "Brother" (B ix 51).
12. Austin Dobson, *Samuel Richardson* (New York and London, 1902), p. 85.
13. Frederick W. Hilles, "The Plan of *Clarissa*," *PQ*, 45 (1966), 240.

Friends and Foes: Noah Webster's Involvement in Personal Politics in Eighteenth- Century American Periodical Publishing

THOMAS H. BROWN*

BEFORE 1786 "there had never been more than three magazines printed in America at once,"¹ but soon after the Revolution was over many new ones appeared in Philadelphia, New Haven, Hartford, Boston, and New York. The first monthly published in New York was Noah Webster's *American Magazine*, which survived for only a year, beginning in December 1787. The account of Webster's vigorous but futile efforts to keep the journal alive illustrates the problems common to fledgling editors of the period, and reveals how easily regional and personal jealousies could condemn a new periodical to extinction even before it was begun.

Some of Webster's friends questioned the wisdom of his decision to try to publish a magazine from New York, but Webster believed that that city, because of its location, would succeed Philadelphia as the communications center of the nation. After the war, New York had been made the port of entry for the whole region east of the Delaware, and mails now entered the city from both north and south twice each week in the winter, three times each week in the summer. Time ultimately proved Webster correct in his faith in the advantages of publishing in New York. Commerce, transportation, and communications developed there as he expected. But in 1787 and 1788 Philadelphia was still unquestionably "the primum mobile of the United States."²

From the beginning, Webster's aspirations for the *American Magazine*'s success exceeded its public reception. As early as January of 1788, he had become disheartened by the arduous task of writing, editing, promoting, and distributing a monthly, and the failure of the enterprise seemed imminent.³ Refusing to succumb to self-pity, Webster began at once to devise a plan that might salvage the maga-

* Associate Professor of English, The University of Mississippi.

zine and his investment in it. Realizing that the entire venture depended upon a broader financial base than his personal, immediate resources could provide, he remained convinced that the magazine could survive if he could interest influential persons in key cities to become co-proprietors. In addition to sharing the printing and distribution costs, co-proprietors would be able to help with promotion, collect subscriptions, and serve as distribution agents. They could also be counted upon to gather or write original pieces for the magazine and forward them to the editor, whose tasks would then be reduced to editing the material, superintending the printing, and distributing the finished magazines to the other proprietors. By sharing the financial responsibilities and ensuring a wider geographical base for the journal, Webster believed that the *American Magazine* could become both a popular and a financial success.

Webster outlined the details of his plan in a letter to Jeremy Belknap, dated February 9, 1788. The property would be divided into ten shares. The editor, who would reside in New York and bear the principal superintendence of the magazine, would hold four shares. A share each would be held by a proprietor in Boston, Connecticut, Philadelphia, Virginia, Charleston, and the tenth share was "to be disposed of in New Jersey, Maryland, or Georgia. . . ."⁴ Those Webster had considered for co-proprietors were Jeremy Belknap, Joel Barlow or John Trumbull, Benjamin Rush, and David Ramsay. He did not yet know who could be obtained in Virginia. Webster suggested that if articles from the partners were regularly communicated to the editor, a magazine of one hundred pages large octavo could be published each month, and, with characteristic hyperbole, he claimed that "such a work would be read by almost every man of tolerable taste and property in America."⁵ Webster unrealistically (one might well say "feverishly") envisioned selling three to five thousand subscriptions. At three dollars a year, clearing one dollar per magazine, each proprietor would gain one hundred dollars profit on every thousand. Webster estimated that "the shares would be worth at least 300 dollars each and probably 500."⁶ Such was the plan he originally outlined to Belknap, adding that he hoped to settle the plan as early as possible.

The new publication was not to appear until the beginning of the next year, January 1789, but Webster wanted to allow a full six

months' time to sell the idea to the public by circulating proposals for subscriptions in the newspapers, because he had already learned, from his own painful experience, the importance of adequate advance advertising in launching a new magazine. Any new venture in publishing would have to be meticulously planned and well advertised in advance of actual appearance.

Webster's plan for an enlarged magazine, owned jointly by ten shareholders, never materialized. Many of the men he had in mind as co-proprietors expressed little or no interest in participating personally in the plan, even though they believed the idea itself commendable. Dr. Rush, for example, who was already a regular, paid contributor to the rival *Columbian*, did not wish to commit himself to making regular contributions, though he did offer to contribute pieces occasionally. Regional jealousies also interfered with the plan's success. Even men of such nationalistic temper as Rush and Jeremy Belknap objected to New York as the new magazine's headquarters, preferring Philadelphia. Finally, the state of transportation and the unreliability of regular communications discouraged a conception whose very success depended upon a reliable communications network.

These obstacles notwithstanding, the plan might have worked—at the very least, it would have been attempted—had it not been for the backstage machinations of Ebenezer Hazard and Jeremy Belknap. Both Belknap and Hazard maintained significant social and literary prominence; Belknap was the pastor of a church in Boston, and Hazard, formerly a considerable bookseller⁷ in New York, was now Postmaster General, a position of prestige and influence. The two shared an interest in collecting American historical materials, although it has been charged that both were "eager to sell their wares to the best bidder."⁸

When Webster wrote to Belknap in February of 1788, outlining the scheme for a new magazine and soliciting his help, both financial and editorial, he demonstrated his shrewd business instincts. Belknap's assistance would have been of great value. His name would have lent prestige; he had a good store of original material at hand for publication; and he enjoyed a devoted audience of *Columbian* readers who probably would have followed his work in another journal. In any case, it is apparent that as early as February 1788, Webster was

energetically attempting to lure regular contributors like Belknap and Rush from *The Columbian* to his own journal. But in failing to consult first with Belknap's New York friend Ebenezer Hazard, and by writing directly to Belknap, Webster made a costly mistake. Hazard's pride was offended, and he thereafter nursed a deep and abiding dislike for Webster. Although he successfully managed to conceal his true feelings from Webster, Hazard spared no detail in his ensuing correspondence with Belknap. Webster had concluded his letter to Belknap: "Such are the outlines of the plan which are submitted to your better judgment. I wish a few friends only to be made acquainted with it, for in private life as in government monarchy is the most energetic in its operations."⁹ Webster's unfortunate reference to "monarchy" was immediately seized upon by Hazard, and in his correspondence with Belknap, Hazard thereafter referred contemptuously to Webster as "the Monarch." In a letter to Belknap dated March 5, 1788, Hazard expressed his opinion both of Webster and Webster's proposal:

I think the *Monarch* a literary puppy, from what little I have seen of him. He certainly does not want understanding, and yet there is a mixture of self-sufficiency, all-sufficiency, and at the same time a degree of insufficiency about him, which is (to me) intolerable. I do not believe that he is fit for a superintendent; that the persons mentioned will be his coadjutors; or that either the *demand* or the *profits* will be any way near equal to his expectations. His specimens already published (3 Nos.) are below mediocrity; and even in them he is too much the hero of the tale. His *plan* of a *Federal* publication, if sensible, judicious men could be engaged to execute it, and an editor of the same stamp could be procured, I think would do well. *Considering circumstances*, I would not advise you to engage with him. . . .¹⁰

It is important to note Hazard's concession that Webster's plan for an enlarged federal magazine possessed merit, but he would not support it if Webster were to be the editor. Possibly Hazard genuinely distrusted the younger Webster's editorial abilities, but the Belknap-Hazard correspondence suggests that Hazard's antipathy towards Webster's proposed new magazine was based on more personal grounds.

Belknap had for years regularly turned to Hazard for advice on a variety of matters, and Hazard had obviously enjoyed his role as ad-

visor. Belknap's future course suddenly became very uncertain when in late September 1786, he was dismissed as minister by his parish in Dover. He served briefly as an itinerant minister, filling in as guest pastor for a week or so wherever he could. In the meantime, Hazard, as Belknap's friend and advisor, sought regular employment for him. Finally, on January 20, 1787, Hazard was able to offer Belknap a full-time position. Hazard had approached Mathew Carey, the publisher and one of the proprietors of Philadelphia's *Columbian Magazine*, and had obtained from him an offer for Belknap's assistance. Through Hazard, the proprietors offered Belknap the editorship of the magazine for one hundred pounds per year. Hazard realized that Belknap could not maintain his family in Philadelphia on this amount, but he suggested that Belknap might supplement this income in many ways. Hazard had secured this offer without consulting Belknap, as he admitted: ". . . perhaps I have gone . . . farther than I ought, but I was led to it by considering your unsettled situation, and a wish to make you more comfortable; and if any hints I have suggested will produce this effect, I shall be very happy" (II,452). By the time Belknap had received Hazard's letter of January 20, however, he had already accepted an invitation to the ministry of a small parish in Boston. Belknap thanked Hazard for his efforts and offered to assist the proprietors of the *Columbian* in any way he could:

Now, my dear sir, if in addition to this (his income from the ministry), the proprietors of the Magazine and Museum will employ me to collect for them in this quarter, the douceur of a few guineas would not come amiss; and I think my opportunities for usefulness in this way would be considerable, if I am fixed in Boston. Pray is the Magazine begun? If it is, I beg to have the numbers that are out; if not, let me have a subscription paper for that and the Museum, and I will do the best I can for both. (II,454)

These events had all occurred just one year before the brash young Webster came along and offered Belknap a partnership in another magazine. Both Hazard and Belknap had been intimately connected with the *Columbian Magazine* since its beginning; so their personal loyalties lay with the *Columbian*. It is not surprising then that Hazard initially discouraged Belknap from any business association with Webster, who was but a "literary puppy."

In March of 1788, Belknap again sought Hazard's advice: "I inclose you [sic] the letter *open* which came in yours of the 1st inst. *sealed*. By it you will see what are the prospects with regard to the Columbian Magazine, and be the better able to make up a judgment of what is best for me to do in regard of continuing with them, or accepting N[oah]. W[ebster].'s proposal" (III,25). Hazard advised Belknap to inform the Columbians of Webster's proposal to encourage them to give Belknap a more "reasonable compensation" for his assistance. He further advised Belknap to continue his assistance to the *Columbian* only upon this condition. Hazard added:

If you can contribute the stipulated assistance to them in case you accept N.W.'s proposal, I see no reason why you should not do the latter too; for if you fulfil your engagements, you do them no injustice.

You may, in this case, as well have two strings to your bow as not, and I think I would advise to it; especially as the Columbian's continuance is uncertain. I would inform N.W. that some consideration was necessary respecting his plan, but I was, upon the whole, inclined to think I would join him, if he could get the other gentlemen he mentioned to me to be concerned. I think no *cash* is to be advanced by you, upon his plan. It will be some months before he can begin, and I would not exclude myself from a chance. (III,26)

Belknap followed Hazard's advice, encouraging both the Columbians and Webster, committing himself to neither. In April Hazard again cautioned Belknap: "I should not be fond of a connection with him, unless I saw it clearly to be for my interest" (III,31). In May he added, "The Monarch (I think) ought to reign alone" (III, 34). And on May 10, he wrote:

I think S. [William Spotswood, then acting-editor of the *Columbian Magazine*] has effectually tied your hands. After such candour, it would be inhuman to leave him. He evidently reposes great confidence in you, and writes like a man of sense and integrity. I have no personal knowledge of him, but his letter has made a very favorable impression upon my mind. (III,35)

By exercising his influence, Hazard clearly could have assisted Webster's endeavor, but, he preferred not to. Instead, he threw his support to both the *Columbian Magazine* and the *American Museum*:

Mr. Carey has informed me that Mr. Thomas Reynolds has gone to Boston to solicit subscriptions for the Museum, and requested me to aid

him by my recommendation. I think the undertaking deserves encouragement, and therefore recommend it to your patronage. You know my friends: recommend it to them. (III,38)

As the summer months of 1788 sped by, Webster received no genuine encouragement from any quarter for his initial plan concerning an enlarged federal periodical. Furthermore, he now realized that the *American Magazine* itself could not long survive without outside financial support. Two avenues yet remained open to him: he could attempt to merge his journal with another, or he could attempt to sell shares in the business of the *American Magazine*. By early November, Webster believed that he had succeeded in forming a "society for publishing the *American Magazine & Universal Register*."¹¹ Hazard outlined the details of the new magazine in a letter to Belknap, November 8, 1788:

The *American Magazine* is to appear in a new form, and on an extensive plan, and to be the property of a *society* of gentlemen, among whom N.W holds but one share; and I am told he is going to remove from hence to Connecticut, so that he will not be the editor. Their plan is to publish 104 pages monthly, 56 of them are to be in the usual magazine style, 24 are to contain State papers, and 24 either historical MSS., such as Winthrop's Journal, or a republication of ancient, valuable, and scarce American histories, such as Smith's of Virginia, &c., &c. (III,71-72)

Hazard possessed a large collection of historical records and papers that he had been anxious to sell, providing the price was right. He had considered publishing them at his own expense, but the possibility of losing his own money in the venture had prevented him from proceeding. In November of 1788, however, Hazard discovered an opportunity to sell them.

In lining up "original" materials for his proposed new federal magazine, Webster had called on Hazard early in November, 1788, and had offered Hazard £500 for his collection of papers. Hazard wrote Belknap that in view of the uncertainty of his being able to publish the papers himself and the improbability that he would clear £500 should he publish them himself, he thought it wisest to accept Webster's offer. The papers were to be published in monthly installments, Hazard to be paid as the installments appeared. Now that Hazard had a financial interest in the magazine's success, he suddenly urged Belknap to support it:

... I made a pretty *safe* bargain; and yet much will depend upon the success of the publication as to the *quickness* of the pay. So that, if you can help the proprietors to some subscribers, you will eventually help me by it. ... The design of the intended publication is no secret now, having been advertised in the newspapers; but I wish you not to say anything about what I am to have for my papers. (III,76-77)

Hazard also now encouraged Belknap to become a regular contributor to the new magazine; but Belknap, asserting that he had never been busier in his life, reluctantly declined, though he urged Hazard to keep the door open for him. As for soliciting subscriptions, Belknap told Hazard, with only a slight trace of irony: "Having lately exerted all my influence among my friends, and in many instances without success, to procure subscriptions for the Columbian Magazine, I do not think it probable that I shall be able to get any for the American . . ." (III,82-83).

Considering Hazard's expressed dislike for Webster, one is surprised to discover that early in December 1788, Webster formed a business alliance with him. On the 5th and 6th of December, Ebenezer Hazard, Francis Childs (a New York printer), and Noah Webster signed articles of agreement for the publishing of a magazine and register.¹² Hazard did *not* disclose his connection with the magazine to his friend Belknap; instead, he now encouraged Belknap to become a partner in Webster's new venture if Webster should again make him an offer:

If N.W. should propose to you to be a *partner* in the intended Magazine, don't hastily refuse it. I think that work will be *established*, especially if the proprietors take my advice, of admitting as proprietors a sufficient number of men of genius to make the whole of the *Magazine original*.¹³ The share of the profits would, in this case, be smaller at first; but I think this plan would procure a number of subscribers, after a while, as would make a share very valuable. (III,84-85)

There was some fear among the partners that Isaiah Thomas's *Massachusetts Magazine*, which was to begin publication in January, would severely hamper their subscription efforts in Massachusetts. As Webster had already made plans to go to Boston, he volunteered to suggest to Thomas a merger of the two magazines. To this proposal Webster's New York partners agreed.

In view of Hazard's derogatory comments about Webster through-

out the year, one can well imagine Belknap's surprise when on January 2, 1789, Noah Webster appeared at his home in Boston, informed him of Hazard's connection with the proposed magazine, and offered him a partnership in the business. Under these awkward circumstances, Belknap simply took the offer under consideration without committing himself and immediately wrote Hazard for advice, because he now found himself, as he said, "solicited *three* ways at once,—by N.W., by the Columbians, and by Thomas" (III,88).

In Hazard's long reply to Belknap's inquiry, he reviewed in detail Webster's attempts to salvage the faltering *American Magazine* and explained, finally, the reasons for his recent interest in Webster's latest proposal. Hazard wrote: ". . . as N.W. had gone farther than I think was justifiable, I suppose myself more at liberty respecting communications to *you* than I should otherwise have been. . . . We agreed among ourselves not to let the proprietors be known, but N.W. has let the cat quite out of the bag" (III,91 and 94). Hazard then recounted his own efforts to sell his collection of papers, concluding that "after a variety of negotiations, I consented to become a partner,—and they agreed to allow me £500 for my papers, to be paid out of the profits of the publication . . ." (III,91).

Webster's negotiations with Isaiah Thomas in Boston had been successful; articles of agreement for a merger of the two magazines had been signed by Webster and Thomas and forwarded to Webster's New York partners for their ratification. Even though Webster believed he had been acting on his partners' behalf, the New York partners, including Hazard, now refused to agree to the merger. Hazard explained why in his letter to Belknap:

A principal objection against the plan of union was the risque and expence of sending materials and publications backwards and forwards through so great a distance: one failure would be fatal to one month's magazine, and a repetition of such a disaster would discourage subscribers. The subscribers here would probably not be satisfied with a magazine printed elsewhere, and could not be furnished with one so early in the month. . . . (III,93)

But Hazard's principal objection to the merger was his unwillingness to give up his papers "on so precarious a chance of a recompence" (III,94). He was not unwilling to proceed with a new magazine, however, providing Webster could be kept out of it:

I am clear for going on without him, which, I think, may be done better than with him; and my plan would be that a sufficient number of literary characters should be united to make the most, if not the whole, of the magazine *original*. The profits upon each share (especially at first) would be but small; but so, on the other hand, would be the risque. Suppose there should be *no* profit for a year or two, and that the work should but barely defray the expence for that time, yet it may be presumed that, if it was conducted with spirit, the public would patronize it, being sure of original entertainment, and that at length the property would become very valuable. . . . All I wish at present is that you would bear this idea in your mind, and not engage yourself so far otherwise as that you may not be able to derive advantage from this source, should it be in your offer hereafter. I know, too, that your genius, abilities, and industry will contribute much to the success of a magazine; and therefore, if I am concerned in one, I should wish to have you along with me. (111,94 and 95)

By February of 1789 it was clear to Webster that he could not persuade his New York partners to effect the merger with Isaiah Thomas. Without the financial and promotional assistance of Ebenezer Hazard and Francis Childs, Webster could not revive the *American Magazine*. Having spent all of his cash reserves on it, having exhausted all prospects for continuing a career in magazine publishing, Webster, discouraged, returned to Hartford intending to practice law.

Thus the *American Magazine*, like the vast majority of other eighteenth-century American journals, was permanently abandoned after the publication of only twelve issues, despite Webster's several efforts to continue it in some form. The plan that Webster outlined to Belknap in Boston has been called the most daring plan for publishing a magazine that had then been conceived in America,¹⁴ and had his proposal for merging the *American Magazine* with Isaiah Thomas's *Massachusetts Magazine* succeeded, "perhaps America could have produced a single periodical with sufficient capital, capable editorship, and talented contributors to hasten the beginning of a national literature. . . ."¹⁵ Regional and personal jealousies, however, effectively doomed his proposals.

In retrospect, it appears that the confident young Webster made a serious error of judgment in failing to court Ebenezer Hazard's patronage and advice immediately upon his coming to New York, for Hazard evidently wielded enough personal influence in Connect-

icut, Massachusetts, and New York to help Webster in his ambitious project. The fate of an eighteenth-century American magazine depended upon many factors, of course—its tone, its format, its place of publication, and its patronage. But without the patronage of the small corps of literati in the major cities that constituted the reading market for magazines, neither contributors nor subscribers could easily be procured. Webster's experience vividly demonstrates the degree to which individual personalities—loyalties and animosities—contributed at that time in North America to a new magazine's ultimate success or failure.

NOTES

1. Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines: 1741-1850* (Cambridge, 1957), p. 29.
2. Emily Ellsworth Fowler Ford, *Notes on the Life of Noah Webster* (privately printed, 1912), I, 177. Letter from Benjamin Rush to Noah Webster. Hereafter cited as *Notes*.
3. See *Letters of Noah Webster*, ed. Harry R. Warfel (New York, 1953), p. 73. Hereafter cited as *Letters*.
4. *Letters*, pp. 74-75.
5. *Letters*, p. 75.
6. *Letters*, p. 75.
7. Charles R. Hildeburn, *Sketches of Printers and Printing in Colonial New York* (New York, 1895), p. 146.
8. *Notes*, I, 178.
9. *Letters*, p. 76.
10. *Belknap Papers: Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society* (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1882), Fifth Series, III, 23. Hereafter cited as *Belknap Papers*. Pagination given in the text.
11. See Webster's *Diary* for November 7-8, 1788, *Notes*, I, 237.
12. See Webster's *Diary*, December 5-6, 1788, *Notes*, I, 238.
13. What Hazard here claims to be his idea is actually what Webster had initially proposed in February.
14. Lyon N. Richardson, *A History of Early American Magazines 1741-1789* (New York, 1931), p. 297.
15. William J. Free, *The Columbian Magazine and American Literary Nationalism* (The Hague, 1968), p. 55.

The Childhood of Morley Roberts

THEOPHILUS E. M. BOLL*

THE most perceptive appreciations of Morley Roberts (1857-1942) as person, litterateur, and scientist are found in Storm Jameson's *Morley Roberts: the Last Eminent Victorian* (1961) and in Mochard Bishop's introduction to *The Private Life of Henry Maitland* (1958). I have tried to supplement these by sketching the history of Roberts's years at Bedford Grammar School (*The Bedfordshire Magazine*, 1980) and his years at Owens College, Manchester (*The Library Chronicle*, University of Pennsylvania, 1980). In this essay I have patched together matters relating to his childhood and arranged them in a perspective whose vanishing point would include the figure his writings made him in truth, if not, as yet, in public visibility. In an appendix I have illustrated from among his 258 short stories three effects or continuations of childhood factors: the revenge theme, the sensitive psychological exploration, and the didactic purpose.

The meager facts about the parents and the childhood of Roberts are drawn from three sources. The first is the notes left among his hodge-podge of literary remains as a guide to a hoped-for biographer. The second is the letters he and his older sister Marion wrote to Storm Jameson, who befriended him in his old age. The third is the memories he casually introduced into his published writings. The first two, which his literary executor, Storm Jameson, placed in the care of the University of Pennsylvania Library, are quoted or summarized here. The published references are cited. His earliest attempt at autobiography he mailed to George Gissing from New Westminster, British Columbia, in 1885: "psychological at that, with snatches of verse and long letters to England." It was lost in the post.

William H. Roberts, the father of Morley Charles Roberts, was the illegitimate son of a colonel of the dragoons, who commanded the depot at Canterbury, and a Kentish woman. The unmarried couple had two children, a boy and a girl. After the colonel left Canterbury for another post, William's mother married, and raised her children without any help from their father.

* Professor Emeritus of English, University of Pennsylvania.

When he was nineteen, William enlisted in the Horse Guards Blue. An officer who appreciated his intelligence and foresaw his prospects nominated him for the Excise Service. From that he was transferred to the Inland Revenue, which became his career for life. At the time he retired he had risen to one grade from the top of his department.

Morley's mother, Katherine, was the daughter of an engineer and millwright at Wandsworth, London. Her family had once owned a good deal of land in Somersetshire, which horse racing and gambling dissipated in two generations. Katherine and William had four girls and three boys. Morley, the second child, was born in London, in Clapham, on December 29, 1857. His brother Cecil was born three years later, and Leslie came twelve years after Morley. Morley's references to his sisters are even scarcer than to his brothers. Marion was the oldest child. Ida was six years younger than Morley; she went on the stage in the company of an actress named Thorne. Marie painted. Bertha, after training at Bart's, became a nurse. His mother and Cecil were the subjects of the warmest feelings Roberts confessed to.

Cecil ran away to Liverpool twice, was brought back by the police, and then was articled by his father to a Liverpool firm of shipping agents, Shaw, Saville and Company. His service took him to America, to the East, and to Europe. Leslie enlisted in the Boer War and was killed in South Africa. Marion was the homebody who stayed in London. Bertha married an engineer named Blane, in Johannesburg. Of Marie we know nothing more.

In his book of essays, *The Wingless Psyche*, Roberts wrote, "My own childhood was not pleasant; only the natural joyousness of a vigorous body gave me the simple pleasure of being, which no one could wholly rob me of" (p. 14). The vigorous body brought him some embarrassment from the visual attention of old ladies, and his handsome legs from the compulsive pinching of an old major.

Somehow, Morley's learning to read was postponed until he was eight, when his family lived in Luton; but before he was eleven he had read practically every book in his father's library that was not in French. Among the five or six hundred books of English classics there, he was most impressed by Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, Thomas Brown's *Philosophy of the Mind*, and all of the eighteenth-century poets. His intense delayed reading

stimulated an intoxicated indulgence in writing. "I remembered that when I was a boy of eleven I wrote a romance with twenty people, men and women, in it. I married them all off at the end, being then in the childish mind of the most usual novelist who believes, or pretends to believe, or at any rate by implication teaches, that the interesting part of life finishes then instead of beginning" (*The Idler*, August, 1893).

His illegitimacy may well have spurred William Roberts to make himself a highly respected person. He taught himself Latin, Greek, German, and French. He was enthusiastic over the English classics through Pope, and regretted his lack of an academic training. "He never knew what he was entitled to be legitimately ignorant of, which is the mark which invariably gives away the selfeducated man. He disliked to profess ignorance of anything."

One note reads, "My father was certainly in many ways a very remarkable man. He ruined the nervous system of everybody connected with him, and yet, to quote Samuel Butler, 'If it was not so awful a thing to say of him, one would say he meant well.'" Another equivocal reference to his father occurs in a letter to Storm Jameson (2.8.41): "My father, though a street angel was more of his and our time a house devil, was a man and very source of energy." It was a deep-felt longing to give and receive love—often bared in his fictional writing—that led Morley Roberts to write, when reporting on the second journey he made through British Columbia, "What a different life we might have had if I had been able to call my father Bill; without the fear and trembling I knew as a child" (*On the Old Trail*, p. 99). Fifteen years later, in the year before he died, he wrote once more, "If my own father had been the man to let us call him Bill, our family history would not have been the thirty years' war that it was, a tragedy almost to the end." His tendency to look for a balancing point of view made him add, "But after all, it is mostly British fathers who built the British Empire." That observation had already been made by Francis Wey in his *Les Anglais chez eux* (ca. 1858), translated by Valerie Pirie as *A Frenchman Among the Victorians* (1936).

The strain of his illegitimacy may have fed Mr. Roberts's chronic rage against his superiors in the revenue service for not rewarding his merits; and in the way of the frustrated, he turned his rage upon

his captive family. During one long period of outrage against his superiors at Somerset House for their failure to acknowledge his brilliant endowment, he stirred up a continuous storm at home with appalling rows and uproars. There were times when the children screamed at him threats to call the police if he did not end his violence. At other times he would have his bed shifted into the study and would take his meals by himself. Then he would speak to no one for nearly two months.

Pity and regret tinged Morley's remembering that his father, when he was old and needed sympathy, discovered that he had not stored up enough of it in the hearts of those who should have loved him most. Those who loved him instinctively could not help feeling uneasy in his presence. "There comes a time when the ceaselessly repressed instincts of affection express themselves in bitter emotions." Pity must have inspired the dedication of a volume of short stories, *The Blue Peter* (January, 1906), "Inscribed affectionately to my Father." The gesture came in time to give pride; both father and mother died in 1908.

Mr. Roberts saw in Morley the promise of a distinguished future, which would help erase the stigma on his birth. He provided him with educational advantages and suggested to him elevated goals. He coached Morley to prophesy to the guests in the home that he would become either the Lord Chancellor or the Governor General of India. Sometimes, after the visitors had gone, Morley's ears were boxed because his father had detected a shade of reluctance in the performance that might have left a dubious impression on the guests. There would follow a long rehearsal that ended with the private announcement to Morley that he would be apprenticed to a greengrocer on the very next morning. The more orders Mr. Roberts issued to compel his son's improving himself, the more obstinate Morley became. He never let his father know that he read at least as diligently as his father was urging him. He would contradict every statement his father made. To himself he fixed his father as a stereotype of the conventional man he was determined he would always defy. That determination became the rule of his lifetime.

At Barnstaple Mr. Roberts thought up an educational program that he could conduct at the same time that he was riding in his gig to attend meetings of assessors and collectors of taxes. He took Morley

along with him to put the boy through a catechism of difficult spelling tests. The plan spelled immediate torture to the boy, although it was not far out of line with a strong-willed Victorian father's method of overcoming a son's temptation to fall short of his best efforts. This early painful ordeal should not be ignored as a factor in stimulating the boy's intellectual development to achieve in time an amazing breadth of vocabulary, in the precise style of his scientific writing, and in the sensitive aptness of his literary writing.

It was at Barnstaple too that Morley and his older sister Marion read and talked over stories together. If a story described children running out to meet their father as he came home from work, they felt wary and suspicious toward the author. Despite their knowing that their father was fond and proud of them, they could not love him. He could not control his temper; his moods of gentleness were temporary and liable to flare into calamity; his violence was beyond forgiveness. Only in his late years when his scholarship in medicine had given him a diagnostic comprehension, did Morley learn that those wild phases of his father's temper were symptoms of a chronic disease, ethmoiditis, for which a distinguished rhinologist, he remembered, had treated him, and a surgeon had operated on him.

The earliest incident convicting the father of causing pain to the son occurred when Morley was three, and the family lived in Birmingham. Some trivial misbehavior, such as crying during a party, angered his father into lifting him on to his toe and propelling him some distance across the floor. "He always treated such emotional symptoms on the homeopathic principle, by giving me so much to cry for that I forgot to do it and roared instead."

Morley was six when he suffered his first serious illness, an attack of acute pneumonia, which he later believed to have been accompanied by pericarditis. His father could not understand why Morley was too unwell to eat his breakfast, and spoke harshly to him. By afternoon the child's screams of pain sent the father running for the doctor. Morley heard the doctor say, "If he is no better tomorrow, he will die." The child felt no apprehension over the pronouncement; he was content, and, delirious, he fell asleep. When he was recovering, he once refused his medicine; his father then beat him. The brutality shocked the child with both surprise and hatred, and his inability to hit back must have fixed the will to win revenge.

It happened in Silsoe that Mr. Roberts behaved with sustained viciousness. He took Morley to an inn and, to get his money's worth, force-fed him with an enormous luncheon of heavy suet pudding with currants. The heavy meal made the child walk so clumsily that he fell, and in falling he split one trouser leg across the knee. Mr. Roberts picked up his horsewhip and charged at the boy, terrifying him, and hunted him round the innyard. But when father and son reentered the gig to move on to the next scheduled meeting, the father took up the next series of difficult words.

Mr. Roberts was a less violent preceptor when he inculcated a passion which Morley was to hear lauded many years later at the dinner which the Authors' Club of London gave him on October 7, 1935, to honor him for his achievements in literature and science. Sir James Barrie was in the chair, but the principal laudation was spoken by the eminent physiologist and anthropologist Sir Arthur Keith, who praised, as the most conspicuous characteristic of his personality, Roberts's passion to discover the truth and to promulgate it with fearless determination. It was a trait, Sir Arthur admitted, that does not easily win approval in a world that finds mass fantasies far more palatable. (Minutes of the Authors' Club, made available by the former Secretary, Mr. Edward Walsh.) That characterization rebuffed critics who, knowing neither Gissing nor Roberts, disparaged Roberts's reliability as a biographer of Gissing.

Morley's father nurtured that passion for honesty by giving examples of the absence of it he had noticed in the course of his duties in the Internal Revenue. "He used to assert with bitterness that no cleric, whatever his hierachal rank, could be relied on to give an absolutely trustworthy account of his income if it had to be stated for purposes of taxation. A vast experience had proved to him that this was the same with deacons and curates, with rectors and vicars, with deans and bishops."—It was not dishonesty, he thought, that made them liars, but their almost universal lack of a simple arithmetical ability.—"He said that the constant preaching of faith led them to reckon by faith, that is, by belief without reason. He used to add, with a shake of a pensive head, that he understood them better than he did schoolmasters, whose passion for subtracting rendered them utterly oblivious of the nobler truth of addition. . . . He believed that schoolmasters and ecclesiastics rarely reached economic truth

without the faithful assistance of someone who does not believe a word they say" (*A Humble Fisherman*, pp. 15-17).

The vigorously masculine adult Morley Roberts became did not betray the sensitiveness he had felt as a child over the absence of politeness in his home, and continued to feel as an adult. If Mordard Bishop's intuition is correct, and I believe it is (Introduction to *The Private Life of Henry Maitland*), Gissing portrayed Roberts in *Born in Exile* as Malkin, the man who intended to pay court to the young daughter of a widow, but who was overwhelmed by the appeals of the mother into proposing marriage to her instead. His friend Earwaker urged Malkin to run away to the Antipodes with his brother, but Malkin groaned, "I can't bring myself to that. I've never yet done anything to be seriously ashamed of, and I can't run away after promising marriage. It would weigh upon me for the rest of my life" (part VI, ch. II).

Roberts believed that children suffered from this want of politeness at home, and that they loved going to other people's houses because there they were treated with the gentleness they did not meet at home. "Every human being is in its own eyes in one sense always grown up." He named Mrs. Ewing as the one novelist who understood children, and a Dr. Leonard Guthrie as a friend he could honor for having that virtue. His sister Marion wrote to Storm Jameson (18.11.47) that Morley and Cecil used to pay long visits to a great friend of their father's, a man who loved children, especially boys. "He was a strict puritanical man, and I believe did actually get some dose of religion into Morley.—I remember when he came back from one of these visits he joined us in singing hymns in the kitchen on several occasions. He was about 14 then."

Even if his mother did betray his misbehaving to his father and brought on him some thrashings, he remembered that she cut out and sewed his first pair of trousers. He addressed her as "Kate," and loved and admired her. She had no education to speak of, but had a marvellous gift of acquiring, organizing, and remembering knowledge out of the pack of monthly magazines she called "the books," of commanding a sum of information far beyond that most educated people ever gathered. She seemed to forget nothing.

She had no need of clocks: an inner clockwork measured the flow of time, and always told her the exact time. What an invaluable

genetic inheritance that was—joined with his father's energy—to facilitate his literary creativity: 258 collected short stories, 30 novels, 2 novels in collaboration with the Orientalist Max Montesole, 6 volumes of travel, 3 volumes of poems, a volume of plays, 5 volumes of essays in biology and sociology, 3 monographs, an edition of letters with introduction and commentary, the editing with generous notes of his brother Cecil's book of travels in America, two biographies, and a scattering of literary and scientific notes.

His mother could draw well. Roberts illustrated one of his travel books and held three exhibitions of his water colors.

At forty, his mother began to study German, and gained a respectable knowledge of it. Morley Roberts somehow acquired a strong dislike for Germans, perhaps from his meeting Max Müller at Oxford when he was a child. He disliked him then, and disliked him increasingly as he grew older; and he did not learn German, to Gissing's regret.

His mother's attitude toward religion was recorded in varying accounts. The one published reference described his mother as "a woman of ferocious religion," of a state of mind that forbade him when he was young confessing to her that he was an atheist (*A Tramp's Notebook*, p. 76). In another note Roberts reported that she was forty when a clergyman threw her into a fit of despair by giving his opinion that *her* mother was condemned to hell because, born a cheerful agnostic, she had despised orthodox religion. Only eleven at the time, Morley dried her flood of tears by assuring her he did not believe the clergyman. In a later note Roberts declared that the final outcome of the clergyman's gloomy verdict was to turn his mother into "a religious indifferentist," that is, an agnostic.

Some of Roberts's poems admit to a residual religious faith: "Death and the Painter" in *Songs of Energy*, and "Death" in *Lyra Mutabilis*. Another, "Failure," in *Lyra Mutabilis*, declares the loss of a faith that had once been held. "The Lamp," in *Songs of Energy*, is an attack on religion. In *The Wingless Psyche*, a book of essays, he resents the whip-like force of church bells. "We have been called, it is enough for us to come when we will. We are almost content to be evil, when we rebel from being made good by compulsion and theological campanology" (p. 12). In the same volume he admitted the possibility of God, but found fault with Him for making so many mistakes.

“He did as much wrong in launching the planets into space with all their possibilities, as a man does in bringing children into the world without being able to keep and train them. It puts the Creator into the position of Rousseau, who sent his offspring to the Foundling Hospital. . . . When I see God, I mean the common conception of Him. It certainly is not mine, if I have any.” Then he wrote as of a ghastly memory: “I went through unutterable religious tortures; I cursed God and was afraid, I had horrible dreams and suffered the infliction of a horrible presence” (p. 40).

“I doubt so often, so very often, that belief comes blindingly like a flash of lightning. I shrink and tremble and put my hands before my eyes” (p. 42).

“I am not yet settled in my soul, and need straining or recrystallization. I am come to a certain point in life” (p. 62).

The idea of Beauty appeared to him to imply the existence of God as a real Being: “There are few things so deserted and abhorred of God that the hem at least of her [Beauty’s] garment has not touched them with a frail and passing virtue. She [Beauty] is a goddess of gifts, and she bestows herself even on the most undeserving” (p. 69).

He confided to his private notes that, brought up, like his mother, in the Church of England, he believed as a boy in a God of infinite power. But he suffered from repeated nightmares. He tried his hardest to keep from falling asleep to avoid the horror, but he fell asleep anyway, right back into the same nightmare, of being in a large ante-room that held a huge white sheet and a felt presence that his eyes could not locate. He prayed to God, Please to take the nightmare away; but it always came back. Not so abrupt as Philip Carey, who dismissed God for not curing his club-foot after He had been prayed to, Morley reflected that perhaps either his power of supplicating convincingly or his flawed righteousness was to blame.

This last confession fully exposes the inward-searching imaginative mind that created the fiber with which it wove numerous stories of psychological analysis.

His precocious insight and his closeness to “Kate” enabled him at one time, on the later edge of childhood, to cure his mother of trying to bully her servants into behaving with moral perfection. “Mother, you need not trouble about their morals, that kind of thing is out of date. If they can’t look after themselves, you can’t be their

fathers and their mothers and all their aunts. For Heaven's sake tell them one of them can go out by night as soon as the work is done." She took his advice. From being an excitable person, she changed into a woman who never admitted anything untoward had happened. The servants performed their work faultlessly, and did not leave her service until they married. The high gratification he confesses in the account of teaching her this lesson perfectly illustrates his enthusiasm for the didactic sentence and for didactic narrative and predicts his practice of it in his fiction.

His father's early years with the Inland Revenue required the family to be sent at the whim of Somerset House wherever a surveyor of taxes was needed: to Birmingham, Barnstable, Luton, Silsoe, Tunbridge Wells, Carlisle, Wigan, Oxford, and to other places, forgotten since, before Morley was twelve ("Reminiscences," *The Strand Magazine*, 1914). He blamed this constant uprooting before he could settle anywhere for some of the perverse, adventurous streak he recognized as an awkward element in his character. "I had to move sooner or later and it was usually sooner." The balancing thought followed: "But this helped me to see a thousand aspects of the world and men that few knew" (*The Old Trail*, p. 174).

His first achievement of the kind of physical endurance that was to carry him through his adventures in Australia, North America, and Switzerland occurred at the age of nine, when he made it to the top of "Robin Hood's Hill" (actually Robinswood Hill) near Gloucester, a climb of all of three hundred feet.

As a child he loved all animals; he owned and cared for all the cats in the house. In his last memoir, unpublished, he recalled the many cats he had loved, and confessed, "I was a big fool about cats." Before he was ten he set his heart on owning a tortoise as a pet, and when his prayer was not answered, he suffered "a living raw wound" for a full six months. When he was nearly sixteen he wanted to leave home—meaning his father—because his father had unwittingly caused the death of a darling tortoise-shell cat. Only the academic ambition that had taken root by then held him at home. His compassion for animals was to form a very special bond with his wife, Alice Selous Hamlyn, whose attitude toward human life was macabre and who pitied all animals for their helplessness under the cruelty of man's tyranny. It inspired a short story, "The Young Man who Stroked

Cats," which appeared in *The Strand Magazine* for December, 1910, and produced a sensation that has kept it among the most moving and prized of English stories.

"Father and Son," a short story in the collection *King Billy of Ballarat* (1892), relates a father's violent temper and cruelty to his son's nightmares—exactly like Morley's—as a cause-linked sequence.

Another short story, one that has the authenticity of a frank statement of the relationship that Roberts believed to exist between his childhood and his fiction, is "The Master of the Story," in the collection *The Great Jester* (1896). In it, a distinguished author, Hamilton Thurston, confesses to a young admirer of his writings that he had evolved directly from an experiencing artist to a creative artist.—"Thurston sketched his childhood in a few sharp lines of unlovely, unloving satire, and the boy stood out predestined. He showed his path of Fate and examined again each motive which impelled or drew him on to the confines of manhood." Thurston makes the point about his stories that Stephen Spender was to make about his poems. Thurston asks, "Does a man invent? No, no, it's a lie, an awful lie. The imagination without knowledge is banal, trivial. The writer can't live without transfusion of blood. Read what I have written with knowledge." It is what he knows, out of his experience with real life, that the writer offers in what is called fiction.

In childhood Roberts once saw a robin catching a big white butterfly and tearing it to pieces. To that glimpse he attributed the conception of his theory of nature, that the symbiosis holding together every organism, single and collective—biological, social, and political—is a hostile relationship. He enunciated this first in his *Warfare in the Human Body* (1920; p. 25), and held it to the end in his fifth volume of essays in social biology, *Bio-Politics* (1938; p. 9).

The most easily recognised after-images in his fiction of the effects of his father's early brutality and violent temper toward him show up in his frequent recourse to revenge as a narrative motive. Roberts dramatised the theme to move in both main directions: to show the cruelty of the thwarted criminal, and the terminal punishment of the vengeful cruel, even the murder of a man who intended to commit murder. The mood is mostly pitiless and macabre, but the story can also be told with a comical flourish. There is a humane variation of an opportunity for revenge ending in forgiveness.

In the last year of life and reflecting on his life, he thought of the continual struggle at home, and wondered at his mother's surviving "the earthquake and volcanic life of domestic conflict," that was painful for the growing artist to experience, but powerful in stimulating his dramatic imagination. He gave his mother, not his father, the final credit for having instilled in him the intellectual curiosity that he regarded as at once his curse and his salvation.

APPENDIX

Stories of Revenge

COLLECTION	TITLE OF STORY
<i>King Billy of Ballarat:</i>	A Quiet Man The Sheriff of Red Butte The Story of Rawhide River Mithridates the King The Magician of El Shomar
<i>The Reputation of George Saxon:</i>	The Troubles of Johann Eckert
<i>The Purification of Dolores Silva:</i>	When She May 'Ooxli
<i>Red Earth:</i>	The Bull-Punchers Fishing at Flynn's Ford The Wedger-off Faro Charlie Red Jim of the S.P.
<i>The Adventures of a Ship's Doctor:</i>	Three Fingers of Bourbon The Extradition of Manresa Dead Finish
<i>The Great Jester:</i>	The Figure-Head of the "White Prince" Within his Rights
<i>Strong Men and True:</i>	The Boss of Myall Blocks Two Men and a River The Mark on the Shack The Affair at Big Springs
<i>The Keeper of the Waters:</i>	The Keeper of the Waters The Pilot An Insulted Ship
<i>The Promotion of the Admiral:</i>	The Promotion of the Admiral The Settlement with Shanghai Smith The Man from Abo

Bianca's Caprice: Grear's Dam
 A Comedy on the Bonaparte
 The Smile of La Gioconda

Captain Balaam of the "Cormorant": The Owner of the "Patriarch"

The Blue Peter: Extra Hands of the "Nemesis"
 The Strange Situation of Captain Brogger

Painted Rock: The Killing of "Sweetwater"
 The Difficulty of the Windy Walker
 The Man Underneath
 Partners Once

Captain Spink: The Regal Authority of Captain Spink
 The Skipper of the S.S. Ringdove

Sea Dogs: Top Dog

Gloomy Fauny: The Air from Verdi
 The Beatus Page

Sweet Herbs and Bitter: The Decree of Nullity

The Lords of the Fo'c'sle: The Mate of the Circassian

The Madonna of the Beech Wood: The Hut by the Lachlan
 The Disintegration of Abilene Bill
 The Resurrection of Beardy Thompson

The White Mamaloi: The White Mamaloi
 App'nted

Psychological Stories

King Billy of Ballarat: Father and Son

The Reputation of George Saxon: The Plot of his Story

The Purification of Dolores Silva: Initiation
 When She May
 The Truth

Red Earth: The Man-Eater
 Deadman's Flat

The Adventures of a Ship's Doctor: Gorton the Magnificent

The Great Jester: The Figure-Head of the "White Prince"
 His Edited Story
 The Master of the Story
 A Good Woman
 The Ass of Buridan
 The Inverse Problem
 Within his Rights
 Madame Morphine
 The Cuckoo Clock

The Keeper of the Waters: The Crowd
The Hatter of Howlong
An Emotional Failure
The Story for Bulmer
The Suggester of Crime
The Father Confessor
The Anticipator

Midsummer Madness: The Closed Chamber

The Madonna of the Beech Wood: The Man Who Lost his Likeness
The White Mamalois: The Man Who Wasn't Selfish Enough

Didactic Stories

The Reputation of George Saxon: On Bear Creek

The Purification of Dolores Silva: Wattle Blossom

Red Earth: The Teamster

The Great Jester: A Weak Brother
Far Off

Strong Men and True: At Waldo

Gloomy Fanny: The Man in the Barn

Captain Balaam of the "Cormorant": The Order of the Wooden Gun

The Wonderful Bishop: The Experience of Mrs. Patterson-Grundy

The Lords of the Fo'c'sle: The Lords of the Fo'c'sle

The Madonna of the Beech Wood: A Case of Have To

The Mirthful Nine: The Pedestal
Limelight
The Peacemakers

Followers of the Sea: The Hijalest of the "Star of Peace"

Where more than one of these classifications could have been applied to a story, I have, to avoid confusing duplication, chosen the more emphasized one.

F. H. Pritchard, introducing a sampling of short stories by Morley Roberts, which Harrap published in 1928, gave notice of the considerable bulk of his work, its diversity in kinds, and its "marvellous range." Roberts set his stage for his short stories as for his novels, wherever he had travelled and lived: at sea or on land; in England, North America, Australia, France, Italy, Switzerland, North and South Africa, and lands in the Asian seas. A separate study will show the justice of Pritchard's estimate.

Lenore versus Pallas Athene: a Reading of Poe's "The Raven"

MARY HALLAB* and CHRISTOPHER NASSAAR†

IT is a general feeling among many readers and even critics of Poe that he wrote his poems and stories merely to achieve sensational effects on the reader, of melancholy, terror, and horror. Poe himself, of course, was responsible for this opinion through his own critical comments, for example, in his condemnation of Hawthorne's too great fondness for allegory, and his scorn expressed in "The Poetic Principle" for what he called "the heresy of *The Didactic*," the mistaken assumption that "the ultimate object of all Poetry is Truth."¹ Thus, Poe himself has seemingly led critics away from the search for "meaning" in his works, and has indeed led some to assert that they have no meaning at all.

Yet in "The Philosophy of Composition," Poe says that two things are invariably required in a poem such as "The Raven": "first, some amount of complexity, or more properly, adaptation; and, secondly, some amount of suggestiveness—some under-current, however indefinite, of meaning" (xiv, 207). Thus Poe clearly indicates that there *is* meaning in "The Raven," however suppressed and indefinite; yet at the same time, he refuses to specify what this meaning is, contrary to the popular opinion that he has, in fact, done so. What he does say in the essay is that the meaning of a poem must be felt or sensed by the reader through its sounds, images, events, rather than directly stated by the poet. Yet this meaning is itself a significant part of the poem's total effect, lending it "richness," although to state it would destroy this effect by turning the poem into prose. In a sense, then, he is inviting us to play detective ourselves; which is not a surprising invitation from the man who invented the detective story, and who was fascinated by anagrams, codes, ciphers, the Kabbala, and hieroglyphics. To be fair to Poe, one must accept his invitation before condemning "The Raven" as lacking in intellectual depth.

* Assistant Professor of English, American University of Beirut.

† Assistant Professor of English, American University of Beirut.

Our point is that the effect of a poem such as "The Raven"—and we must admit that it *has* its effect—resides in something more than simply the sentimental feelings called up by the death of a beautiful woman, who is, in any case, only very vaguely described, and that "The Raven," like so many of Poe's other works, is deliberately and often brilliantly symbolical.

Walt Whitman found that the substance of Poe's poetry, like that of many other poets, lay "in diagnosing this disease called humanity." It is a commonplace in regard to Poe that in many of his works he deals with a diseased mind, with the mind in isolation and in conflict with itself. This theme of the soul divided against itself, so common in Poe as to pervade his works, is frequently represented by the *double*, as in his stories "William Wilson" and "The Man in the Crowd." In his essay "That Spectre in My Path," Patrick F. Quinn explores Poe's treatment of the psychology of "the Bi-Part Soul," or *Doppelgänger*, which can be found even in such works as "The Tell-Tale Heart" and "The Fall of the House of Usher."² In many of these tales, one part of the soul becomes the destroyer of the other. Very often the conflict lies in the moral versus the criminal elements of the character, as in "William Wilson." Even in such a seemingly unlikely work as "The Purloined Letter," the detective Dupin suggests that his opponent, the criminal Minister D—, whom he destroys, is a sort of second side of himself, he the principled, the other the unprincipled, genius.

In "The Raven," the conflict does not lie in moral versus criminal tendencies, nor are the two parts of the soul represented by doubles. They are symbolized by the two women in the poem, Lenore and the less obvious Pallas Athene. In an excellent essay, "The House of Poe," Richard Wilbur remarks that, as we contemplate the decor of any of Poe's rooms, we must remember that the room is a state of mind, and that everything in it is therefore a thought, a mental image.³ This is especially true of "The Raven" and of the two women in the poem, who are externalized symbols of the opposing qualities in the speaker.

For in "The Raven," Poe dissects the diseased soul of the lover of beauty who has fallen victim to the plague of rationalism. The poet-narrator of "The Raven" is a man with a divided personality; he is a scholar whose devotion to rationalism, symbolized in Pallas Athene,

has seriously tainted, even destroyed, his pure and spontaneous love of beauty, whose symbol is Lenore. It is in this sense that Lenore is "dead," though Pallas has been unable to destroy the poet's memory, his longing and love for his lost maiden, who, though dead in his world, is alive in heaven, while Pallas, though she dominates the poet's chamber, is a lifeless bust. Lenore has Christian associations—she is among the angels, and is "sainted"—while Pallas is a pagan and non-Christian goddess, the goddess of rationalism. Lenore has a human figure, "rare and radiant," but Pallas is a cold and severed sculptured head, pale as a corpse.

These two women appear in various guises in other works by Poe. Lenore is the same beautiful woman who dies over and over again in so many of Poe's other poems and tales. In the poem "Lenore," for example, the poet laments the death of his beloved, a "dear child," "fair and *debonaire*," and laments that innocence and hope have died with her; yet he resists despair, for like the Lenore of "The Raven," she is now a "saintly soul," an angel, on a flight from this "damnéd Earth" to "a high estate far up within the Heaven." Annabel Lee, in the poem of that name, is also a "child," as is her lover. In "Eulalie," the heroine is "fair and gentle," "bright-eyed," and "radiant," whose yellow curls, "unregarded," "careless," reveal her naturalness and spontaneity. Charles L. Sanford points out that Poe's beautiful young women are almost always associated with the beauty of nature.⁴ In "To One in Paradise," the speaker in expressing his love for the maiden says she was to him "A green isle in the sea. . . . All wreathed with fairy fruits and flowers." In "Sonnet to Zante," the "maiden that is / No more" has become associated with the "fair isle," the "verdant slopes," of the scene of the lovers' departed bliss.

What do these young women have in common? They are all, of course, young and beautiful, innocent, almost childlike, often fair-haired and fair-skinned. They are associated through the imagery used to describe them with nature, with flowers, birds, with spaciousness, with sunlight and a kind of radiance, and with a joyful and spontaneous love of nature, of natural beauty, and of life itself. They are innocence, beauty, and hope. Thus, they symbolize "that wild effort to reach the Beauty above," which Poe defines as the province of the poet, "the Human Aspiration for Supernal Beauty," which can best be expressed through the theme of love.

Pallas Athene, on the other hand, represents the knowledge or wisdom—we might say the analytical propensity—that kills the youthful, spontaneous, and intuitive love of beauty. It is true that she very seldom appears in any of Poe's other works in the form of a woman, although we would like to argue that in two of his tales, she does so appear. In "Ligeia" and "Morella" the heroines have a somewhat different identity from that of the heroines described above, although they do share the characteristic of an almost supernatural beauty. Ligeia, for example, is never depicted in terms of the beauties of nature. Rather, she is a goddess, tall in stature, majestic, with a "marble hand," and a "lofty and pale forehead." In contrast, her eyes and hair are "raven-black." Her beauty, rather than that of nature, is the "radiance of an opium-dream—an airy and spirit-lifting vision." It has "the fulness and the spirituality, of the Greek."

The lovers in this tale do not roam freely and innocently through uncorrupted nature, but spend their time in close study together. For Ligeia's learning is immense; she is proficient in the classical languages; her erudition is "gigantic," "astounding." And the narrator of the story has come to rely completely on "her guidance through the chaotic world of metaphysical investigation." Her name, Ligeia, is also of classical origin, Ligeia being one of the sirens. We might recall that in *The Odyssey*, the sirens entice Odysseus with a song of the knowledge of all things in the world; but that, of course, their song is destructive. Though she seems placid, Ligeia is a prey, not to innocent love, but to "the tumultuous vultures of stern passion," the tendency of which, Poe says in "The Poetic Principle," "is to degrade, rather than to elevate the Soul" (xiv, 290). In Ligeia, passion accompanies or supports an intense will that allows her to dominate the poet, and even more, after her death, to take over—in his mind, at least—the body of his second, now also deceased, wife, "the fair-haired and blue-eyed Lady Rowena Trevanion, of Tremaine."

Morella, too, in the story of that name, is profoundly erudite; "her powers of mind were gigantic." Again, the narrator does not share with her an innocent and spontaneous love, but simply finds himself dominated by her intellectual superiority and her strong will. In this story, however, he begins to find her hateful, as she places her "cold hand" on his shoulder and rakes "up from the ashes of a dead phi-

losophy some low, singular words, whose strange meaning burned themselves in upon [his] memory." Under the force of her learning, he suddenly finds that joy "faded into horror, and the most beautiful became the most hideous." Here, again, knowledge destroys the ability to respond to beauty. Morella, too, dies, but like Ligeia, is temporarily reborn, by virtue of her passionate will, in the body of another, their daughter, a child who quickly follows her into death. Again, we have a picture of a strong and dominating woman, who, we must not forget, symbolizes some part of the soul of the speaker himself—here, the dominant intellect and will.

This rule of the analyzing intellect, of knowledge, over beauty, is not always represented by women. In many cases, the dominating intellect is embodied in the male lover himself. In "Berenice," the narrator tells us of his beautiful cousin, "agile, graceful, overflowing with energy," who loved to ramble in nature "with no thought of the shadows in her path, or the silent flight of the raven-winged hours," who wastes away to death as his own "disease" grows stronger. He implies that it is this "disease" of his that kills her, for he develops a "morbid irritability of those properties of the mind in metaphysical science termed the *attentive*." He confesses, in fact, that "During the brightest days of her unparalleled beauty," he had never really loved her, for his feelings "*had never been* of the heart," but only passions of the mind. He had seen Berenice, not as living and breathing, "a being of the earth, earthy, but to analyze; not as an object of love, but as the theme of the most abstruse although desultory speculation." The suggestion in the story is, then, that Berenice is, almost literally, *analyzed* to death.

In "The Oval Portrait," an artist, "passionate, studious, austere," destroys his beautiful and lively young love by closing her up in a turret to paint her portrait. In trying to interpret on canvas her gaiety and liveliness, he destroys the real thing; she dies as the painting is completed. Like the narrator of "Berenice," he has fatally erred in regarding beauty as an object of analysis rather than of spontaneous and natural regard.

This theme of the killing effect of knowledge on beauty is expressed explicitly by Poe in his early "Sonnet—to Science":

Science! true daughter of Old Time thou art!
Who alterest all things with thy peering eyes.

Why preyst thou thus upon the poet's heart,
Vulture, whose wings are dull realities?
How should he love thee? or how deem thee wise,
Who wouldest not leave him in his wandering
To seek for treasure in the jewelled skies,
Albeit he soared with an undaunted wing?
Hast thou not dragged Diana from her car?
And driven the Hamadryad from the wood
To seek a shelter in some happier star?
Hast thou not torn the Naiad from her flood,
The Elfin from the green grass, and from me
The summer dream beneath the tamarind tree? (vii, 22)

This sonnet was first published as a preface to Poe's mystifying poem "Al Aaraaf," in which Al Aaraaf represents, perhaps, the "happier star" mentioned above. It is a middle world between ours and Heaven, and its beauties, too, are described in terms of lush gardens, woodland melody, abundant flowers. The ruler of this realm, Nesace, speaks of the Seraphs who live there as "Seraphs in all but 'Knowledge,' the keen light / That fell, refracted, thro' thy bounds, afar, / O Death!" Knowledge, then, is regarded as "error," as "Death." On this "star" there lives a mortal, Angelo, who occasionally looks back to Earth with longing, especially to the spot from which he departed, the Parthenon, the temple of Athene, goddess of wisdom. Thus knowledge is explicitly associated with Earth (vii, 23-39). In "The Colloquy of Monos and Una," it is "the leading evil—Knowledge" which has led mankind away from beauty, nature, and life; it is "poison" (III, 203, 205).

This conflict between Knowledge and Beauty, then, is not only individual, psychological, a conflict of the mind, but is also cosmic and universal in its implications. In dealing with the allegory he finds in Poe's works, Richard Wilbur outlines what he believes to be the "cosmic myth" on which it is based, an interpretation which finds ample support in such works as "Colloquy of Monos and Una," "Al Aaraaf," and *Eureka*:

Poe conceived of God as a poet. The universe, therefore, was an artistic creation, a poem composed by God. Now, if the universe is a poem, it follows that the one proper response to it is aesthetic, and that God's creatures are attuned to Him in proportion as their imaginations are

ravished by the beauty and harmony of His creation. Not to worship beauty, not to regard poetic knowledge as divine, would be to turn one's back on God and fall from grace.⁵

The planet Earth has fallen from God, for its inhabitants have exalted rationalism and materialism over "poetic intuition" and "visionary knowledge." The souls of men are diseased and have contaminated nature, so that the fields and woods no longer express the Beauty which is God's; "the landscape has lost its original perfection of composition, in proportion as men have lost their power to perceive the beautiful."⁶

How does all this apply to "The Raven"? As the poem begins, Lenore is already dead and the bust of Pallas dominates. The narrator is Poe himself, seemingly, moving in the direction of spiritual death. He has turned to his books—"many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore"—in an attempt to banish the memory of Lenore; to become, that is, completely a worshipper of Pallas, to destroy absolutely the memory of his young and beautiful love. Yet the words he uses, "quaint," "curious," "forgotten," suggest his low opinion of truth and knowledge, his sense of their irrelevance in this case. But he is a scholar; and we must not forget that, as in so many of Poe's other works, the suggestion here is that it is his very devotion to this lore that has destroyed Lenore, the symbol of beauty, love, hope, just as "the ashes of a dead philosophy" in "Berenice," turn beauty to horror. He is nodding, "nearly napping," by the faint light he uses to pore over his books. If, as Wilbur suggests, we should take the room as representing his own mind, then we see that the light is merely the dim light of his own thoughts, and his condition (that of a dying man, "weak and weary") is reflected in the image of the dying embers.

The room in which he sits is richly furnished. Cluttered with books and dominated by the bust of Pallas, it also contains an abundance of silk purple curtains and a cushioned seat with a velvet violet lining. These luxurious trappings are associated with the love of Lenore. Indeed, we are told that, when alive, Lenore used to "press" the richly lined cushioned seat. These objects, as well as his fading memories of Lenore, suggest that the aesthetic impulse still survives in the speaker's soul, though weakened and tainted by rationalism. It is all the poet has left to him, for nature—outside—is no longer full of flowers, light, and music, but has been corrupted by knowledge into a world

of darkness and death. "The Raven" begins on a silent "midnight dreary" of "bleak December," which later in the poem develops into a "tempest," as the poet gradually becomes aware of the full nature of his "disease." The stormy night of "The Raven" thus suggests, in terms of Wilbur's version of Poe's cosmology, the fall from grace of the planet Earth. All is darkness, and all that remains is the dim, artificial light of the chamber itself, in which the "silken, sad, uncertain rustling of each purple curtain"—the agitation of his own corrupted responses—thrills the poet with "fantastic terrors." Lenore is dead, and the potential for a spontaneous and "divine" reaction to beauty has become that of the diseased aesthete for whom nature, life, is contaminated, diseased, dying. He is left with plush and elegant furniture, a cold statue, and a clutter of useless "lore." He is cut off from God; hence, his symbolic self-imprisonment in his study. He can now attain excitement, though not elevation, of the soul only through his developing sense of horror at his own condition.

Yet, at the beginning of the poem, the narrator still has hope; and when he hears the tapping at his chamber door, he hopes for a visitor of any kind from the world outside his study. Then, discovering no one is outside, he vainly dreams "dreams no mortal ever dared to dream before," that Lenore has returned from the dead, that he can recover his lost innocence, love, sense of beauty. He knows, of course, that the rare and radiant Lenore cannot possibly exist in the total blackness of fallen nature, but by deliberately suggesting to himself that her ghost is outside, he manages to extract a thrill of horror from the dark and empty night. The following is a point to be stressed: it is through the memory of Lenore and the rustling of the purple silk curtains, both symbols of the aesthetic impulse, although the latter is weakened and inferior, that he is able to dream "dreams no mortal ever dared to dream before." And it is through the memory of Lenore, of their love, that he finally works himself into the state in which we find him at the end of the poem.

Temporarily, his soul becomes strangely rejuvenated; the aesthetic fire, which was on the verge of being totally stifled by Pallas in the first two stanzas of the poem, begins to burn with a terrible flame. He opens the window, only to find himself confronted with a "stately Raven," which enters the room, making "no obeisance," as though it belongs there, and perches on the bust of Pallas, overlooking and

dominating the scene, where it remains throughout the poem, and indeed, forever.

It is significant to note that the raven is traditionally a bird of ill omen, associated with death. Moreover, if the editors of *The American Tradition in Literature* are correct, "Poe's conscious selection of Pallas Athena, goddess of wisdom, for the raven's perch, recalls his reported attempt, in an early draft, to have the bitter truth revealed by an owl, Athena's traditional bird of wisdom."⁷ The basic logic behind the choice of the raven is plain enough; it will be further developed in the course of this paper. The raven, then, as surrogate for the owl, represents knowledge, in fact, the knowledge which is death, for it comes from the "Night's Plutonian shore." And it is appropriate, within the context of the poem, that the most prominent symbol of rationalism should be a mindless bird, quoting the same meaningless answer to every question that confronts it, a point that underscores the essential meaninglessness and irrelevancy of rational truth or "lore." The bird is drawn, then, to that in the chamber which is closest to its own nature. The deathlike, icy whiteness of the bodiless Pallas complements the deathlike blackness of the raven, just as the pallor of Ligeia is set off by her raven-black hair. Yet the name Pallas is associated with Athene's role as goddess of the storm; so it connects her with the raging elements outside, from which the raven, her bird, has recently emerged.

The raven is a symbol which gradually gains meaning, for the narrator and the reader, as the poem progresses. When it first enters, the speaker views it with amusement and mild curiosity, as a kind of distraction from his gloomy thoughts. His initial attempt to see the bird as a figure of humor or as belonging to the "saintly days of yore" (that is, to the days when physical nature was still uncorrupted) is simply wishful thinking brought on by his immediate association of the bird with the "whispered word—Lenore," which comes from his own heart. Up to this point, in fact, the speaker, having briefly revived his contact with the fading memory of Lenore, immediately projects his aroused hopes onto the bird. In stanza ten, he indicates that he has thought of the bird as a potential friend, a means of escape from his deathlike state of reverie. But his hopes are quickly negated by its blackness and ominous appearance: "grim, ungainly, ghastly, gaunt."

Still trying, however, he sets himself, in his analytical way, to find out more about the bird, to extract meaning from this ludicrous situation. He begins to realize that the one meaningless word the raven utters whenever a question is posed to it can be rendered meaningful if one poses the right question. Sinking upon a velvet cushioned seat, he indulges in “linking / Fancy unto fancy,” in “thinking,” “guessing,” “divining.” Here, then, is the explanation of the death of Lenore; or, if one remembers that these events are all in his mind, the explanation for the displacement or destruction, for him, of the appreciation of beauty. Like Berenice, Lenore is a symbol of untainted beauty that cannot coexist with rationalism; her very name echoes the two words *no* and *lore*. The speaker’s studious absorption with “lore,” his clutter of books, precludes any spontaneous, natural aesthetic response to the beauty that is heavenly. Thus, if he is to attain excitement hereafter, it will have to include his books, his learning; it will have to be the inferior passion of truth, objectified now in the raven.

The rest of the poem recreates the speaker’s attempt, by turning his focus onto the bird, to assuage his grief by creating in himself a permanent sense of heightened experience, to render himself “by Horror haunted.” It is the same grotesque and misdirected absorption in intense experience that the mad Roderick Usher enjoys in listening to his sister’s struggles or that the crazed narrator of “Berenice” derives from his obsession with his dead beloved’s *teeth*. In “The Raven,” the teller of the tale begins, through the bird, to work himself up to a kind of frenzy of passion. He begins to see it as a demon “whose fiery eyes now burned into [his] bosom’s core.” That is, recognizing the raven among the symbolic furnishings of his own mind, he becomes aware of, even cultivates in himself, his demonic part, the demon he has become by the loss of all that is beauty and hope.

Thus, the lamp-light, too, is “gloating” over the scene; it is the symbol of his own thoughts, which finally cast the oppressive shadow of the raven forever before him. He has begun the imaginative process which will lead him to an awareness of rationalism as a vision of horror. But his doing so depends on his memory of Lenore, of what he has lost. He thinks long and deeply before he reaches the sad intensity of, “*She, shall press, ah, nevermore!*” In his perversity, he deliberately fans his sorrow for Lenore, bringing the mental images

of divine beauty into prominence, so as to intensify his vision of the raven as a “thing of evil,” and he begins to frame questions deliberately designed, if answered with “Nevermore,” to crush all his hopes of uniting with the “sainted maiden”; of ever again, that is, attaining an aesthetic state uncorrupted by scientific rationalism. The “muttered” of line 58, when the poet first becomes aware of the raven’s potential meaning for him, has, by line 97, been raised to the very high pitch of a shriek of horror:

“Be that word our sign of parting, bird or fiend!” I
shrieked, upstarting—

“Get thee back into the tempest and the Night’s Plutonian
shore!

Leave no black plume as a token of that lie thy soul
hath spoken!

Leave my loneliness unbroken!—quit the bust above my door!
Take thy beak from out my heart, and take thy form from
off my door!”

Quoth the Raven, “Nevermore.” (vii, 97-102)

This is the climax of the poem. The man of the poem has worked himself into a pitch of excitement, and sees the bird as a fiend, a torturer with its beak in his heart.

In “The Philosophy of Composition,” Poe quotes the last two verses of this stanza as those in which he believes the undercurrent of meaning, so essential to the poem, is first apparent; and in quoting them, he gives us a valuable clue; for the demon-bird with its “fiery eyes” that peer into the heart of the speaker in “The Raven,” which eventually sinks its beak—metaphorically, as Poe notes—into his heart, has become the vulture of the “Sonnet—to Science,” “whose wings are dull realities,” which alters all things with its “peering eyes,” which preys upon the poet’s heart and tears him from his “summer dream.”

In spite of the narrator’s wild protests, however, the bird will never remove its beak from his heart, for in the following and final stanza of the poem we are told:

And the Raven, never flitting, still is sitting, *still* is sitting
On the pallid bust of Pallas just above my chamber door;
And his eyes have all the seeming of a demon’s that is
dreaming,

And the lamp-light o'er him streaming throws his shadow
on the floor;
And my soul from out that shadow that lies floating on
the floor

Shall be lifted—nevermore! (vii, 103-108)

In his "Marginalia," Poe says,

True passion is prosaic—homely. Any strong mental emotion stimulates *all* the mental faculties; thus grief the imagination:—but in proportion as the effect is strengthened, the cause surceases. The excited fancy triumphs—the grief is subdued—chastened,—is no longer grief. In this mood we are poetic, and it is clear that a poem now written will be poetic in the exact ratio of its dispassion. A passionate poem is a contradiction in terms. (xvi, 56)

This is the process we have followed in analyzing this poem: the narrator's grief stimulates his imagination and causes him to regard the raven as symbolic. In doing so, as he becomes intensely excited, his grief recedes. Finally, in the last stanza, the speaker's passion wanes, for he has, in effect, given himself over to horror, has accepted the demon-knowledge within his own heart. This stanza perfectly captures the aura of everlasting damnation. The poet's *soul*, that part of him which might be excited by beauty, is permanently in shadow. The bird remains forever over his door, with its beak forever in his heart. This fusion is stressed in the final lines of the poem, when the speaker's soul blends in the lamplight with the shadow of the raven, in an eternal union of demonic forces.

Poe's insistence that the raven, at the end of the poem, is "emblematical of *Mouriful and Never-ending Remembrance*" (xiv, 208) does not, then, reveal the deeper and more obscure significance of the bird, but rather tends to befog it; for, as we noted earlier, Poe had no intention of deciphering "The Raven" for his readers. The remembrance of the young and beautiful Lenore, revived in the poet by the raven's appearance, is necessary for him to turn rationalism into a vision of horror, the horror of realization that love, innocence, hope, beauty are forever dead for him. Pallas and her bird dominate, while Lenore remains but a sad memory of what he once possessed. Untainted beauty linked with God is not attainable for a diseased aesthete, for a fallen man corrupted by knowledge. Giving up hope for it completely, he becomes absorbed in, even one with, the reali-

zation and horror of what he has become. The poem ends with the dubious triumph of the speaker's new kind of aesthetic impulse, embodied in the raven, the intense obsession with the melancholy, the horrible, the grotesque, and the weird, within the framework and limitations of rationalism.

Thus, "The Raven" tells of the fall of a poet through knowledge, and more, of his awareness of that fall. It is a fall that each man experiences in his own lifetime. Poe's poem "Tamerlane" contains the melancholy lines:

And boyhood is a summer sun
Whose waning is the dreariest one—
For all we live to know is known
And all we seek to keep hath flown—
Let life, then, as the day-flower, fall
With the noon-day beauty—which is all. (vii, 8)

The spontaneous and intuitive love of beauty, the hope, is for youth alone. Richard Wilbur notes that as a child, Poe's poet enjoys an imaginative and divine response to the universe, but entry into adult life brings awareness of a "fallen world in which the physical, the factual, the rational, the prosaic are not escapable"; he becomes "compromised," losing his "perfect spirituality."¹⁸ Something of the same idea is expressed in the well-known poem "The Bells," in which the poet projects, through the sound of the bells, the periods of a man's life, from youthful hope, happiness, love, to doubt, terror, passion, and finally, in old age, "to a world of solemn thought." It is in this condition that we leave the narrator of "The Raven," bereft of his love, free of his intense grief, lost forever in melancholy thought.

"The Raven" scarcely ends on the note of "elevation" that we see at the end of the earlier poem "Lenore" or "To Helen" (1848), in which the poet remembers his love with joy. In "The Raven," there is no memory of the beloved's beautiful eyes, which in "To Helen," the speaker says, "fill my soul with Beauty (which is Hope)," or which in "Annabel Lee" rise with the stars to keep away the angels and demons who might sever his soul from that of his beloved. In "The Raven," Poe is able to give the reader a vision of "Supernal Beauty" only by recreating in his speaking character the melancholy and despair brought about by the sense of its permanent loss. His vision of heaven, through the memory of the apprehension of Beauty,

must now be perceived only through his awareness of his personal hell, a hell which comes to all men through the insidious workings of knowledge.

This leads to our final point. The form of "The Raven" is an exact reflection of its content. Poe tells us how he carefully composed the poem with its alliteration, internal rhyme, and symbolism, revealing the most painstaking attention to structure and detail. The verse lines, moreover, are composed in strict observance of the mechanical, as against the organic, principle. In other words, a scientific, rational mind planned and wrote "The Raven." The mechanical lines, however, with their heavy alliteration and internal rhyme, tune the senses and the mind to a preposterous key, thereby removing the reader from the real world and plunging him into a strange dream world, of the narrator's own mind, which turns out to be one of horror and despair. In its form, then, "The Raven" uses scientific reason to create a dream world of horror, and this is precisely what its content is. There is irony in the poet's analytical approach to the production of an effect which rests, as well, on the theme of the triumph of intellect and knowledge at the cost of the loss of love, of hope, of the intuitive and spontaneous appreciation of beauty that is the province of the poet and the privilege of youth. The poem, then, is not only about the loss of youth and innocence, about the Fall of Man, but also about the poet's loss of the vision of Heaven which only love and beauty give, and which it is his special province to convey.

NOTES

1. *The Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, ed. James A. Harrison (New York, 1902), xiv, 271. All subsequent quotations from Poe's works are drawn from this edition.
2. Patrick F. Quinn, *The French Face of Edgar Poe* (Carbondale, 1957), pp. 216-256.
3. Richard Wilbur, "The House of Poe," *The Recognition of Edgar Allan Poe: Selected Criticism Since 1829*, ed. Eric W. Carlson (Ann Arbor, 1966), pp. 260-261; rpt. from the *Library of Congress Anniversary Lecture*, May 4, 1959.
4. Charles L. Sanford, "Edgar Allan Poe," *The Recognition of Edgar Allan Poe*, p. 302; rpt. from *Rives*, no. 18 (Spring, 1962), pp. 1-9.
5. Wilbur, pp. 257-258.
6. Wilbur, p. 258.
7. *The American Tradition in Literature*, 3rd ed. by Bradley, Beatty, and Long (New York, 1967), 1, 796n.
8. Wilbur, p. 258.

“The Mask of the Red Death” and Poe’s Reading of Hawthorne

CHARLES N. WATSON, JR.*

POE’s admiration for Hawthorne’s *Twice-Told Tales*, reflected chiefly in the well-known 1842 review in *Graham’s Magazine*, appears also in “The Mask of the Red Death: a Fantasy,” which has been shown to bear a number of resemblances to Hawthorne’s four “Legends of the Province House.”¹ Poe’s “Mask” may have been equally influenced, however, by two other *Twice-Told Tales*, “The May-Pole of Merry Mount” and “The Haunted Mind,” each of which speaks to one of Poe’s deepest concerns—the function of art in relation to the destructive forces of time. Although certainly the theme of art and time is universal, the parallels extend to a number of specific images and verbal echoes, and all three tales portray the artist as the creator of a moment of illusory stasis that must soon give way to an apparition of death.

Like Poe’s Prospero, the high priest of Merry Mount retreats from an external menace by gathering a band of revelers into temporary seclusion, where he engages in a festive masquerade until the moment of his downfall. As an English royalist, a “clerk of Oxford,”² he has moved with his followers to the apparent safety of his oasis in the wilderness to escape “the rapid growth of Puritanism.” Prospero, in his retreat from the Red Death, brings with him “all the appliances of pleasure”; the Merry Mounters likewise “imagined a wild philosophy of pleasure, and came hither to act out their latest day-dream.” Among Prospero’s companions “there were buffoons, there were improvisatori, there were ballet-dancers, there were musicians, there were cards, there was Beauty, there was wine,” while in the train of the Merry Mounters were “minstrels, not unknown in London streets; wandering players, whose theatres had been the halls of noblemen; mummers, rope-dancers, and mountebanks . . . in a word, mirth makers of every sort.” In Prospero’s festive abbey, moreover,

* Associate Professor of English, Syracuse University.

"it was folly to grieve, or to think," just as "it was high treason to be sad at Merry Mount."

Prince Prospero's chief aim is to escape the ravages of time, the inevitability of death. This is also the desire of Hawthorne in his sketch "The Haunted Mind," for his fanciful dreaming leads him to "an intermediate space, where the business of life does not intrude; where the passing moment lingers and becomes truly the present." He wishes that Father Time himself "would fall asleep, and let mortals live on without growing older!" But this fantasy is penetrated by the hourly chiming of a clock; and even while envisioning the fanciful frostwork on the windowpane as a "frozen dream," Hawthorne observes that through the clear portion of the glass "you may almost distinguish the figures on the clock that has just told the hour." In the "Mask," Poe seems to adopt Hawthorne's images. Prospero's masquerade is peopled by a "multitude of dreams," which, at the sound of the "ebony clock," are "stiff-frozen as they stand."¹³

But though in "The Haunted Mind" the tolling clock intrudes on the frozen dream, it does not occasion any such meditative pause as occurs in the "Mask," where there was "a brief disconcert of the whole gay company" and "the more aged and sedate passed their hands over their brows as if in confused reverie or meditation." Instead, Poe may have taken a hint for this reflective moment from Edith and Edgar in "The May-Pole of Merry Mount," whose pause, like that of Prospero's revelers, occurs in the midst of gay music, when Edgar looks into Edith's eyes and, startled by "the almost pensive glance that met his own," begins to wonder whether "yon wreath of roses [is] a garland to hang above our graves." In the "Mask," too, at the sound of the midnight chime "more of thought crept, with more of time, into the meditations of the thoughtful among those who revelled." But in both tales such uneasiness is only temporary, for the dreamlike festivities continue until an unwelcome intruder suddenly brings them to an end.

Even Poe's allegorical representation of the Red Death may have been partially suggested by Hawthorne's tales. In "The Haunted Mind," the flight from time is interrupted by a ghostly procession, for in the "depths of every heart," says Hawthorne, "there is a tomb and a dungeon, though the lights, the music, and revelry above may cause us to forget their existence, and the buried ones, or prisoners

whom they hide." Amid such revelry, it is "oftenest at midnight" that the "dark receptacles are flung wide open," giving rise to a "funeral train," in which "things of the mind become dim spectres to the eye." Concerning the specter of Remorse, Hawthorne asks, "What if he should stand at your bed's foot, in the likeness of a corpse, with a bloody stain upon the shroud?" Poe's Red Death, as well, comes at the stroke of midnight, "shrouded from head to foot in the habiliments of the grave," with his vesture "dabbled in *blood*."

Still another such intrusion of unwelcome specters into fanciful visions occurs in "The May-Pole." Led by John Endicott, the "dark-some figures" of the Puritans become "intermixed with the wild shapes of their foes," making the scene resemble the moment "when waking thoughts start up amid the scattered fantasies of a dream." In both tales, moreover, the sudden appearance of the intruder intimidates the revelers. Among the Merry Mounters, "no fantastic foolery could look [Endicott] in the face"; and in Poe's tale, owing to the "nameless awe" with which the intruder inspires the masquers, "there were found none who put forth hand to seize him."

As the figure of the Red Death advances, Prince Prospero's bold challenge, his horror at the unmasked face, and his dropping of his dagger seem almost to reverse the elements of the clash between John Endicott and the priest of Merry Mount.⁴ In the "Mask," the challenge is issued by the prince, only to be undercut by the fall of his dagger, a figurative decline of potency in the face of time and death. In Hawthorne's tale, the challenge comes not from the priest but from the intruder, Endicott, whose sword ruthlessly slashes down that symbol of perpetual youth and potency, the maypole. The significance of the two incidents, however, is not only psychological, but also esthetic.

This last point suggests a special reason for Poe's appreciative response to Hawthorne's two tales. What he found in "The Haunted Mind" was a dream-vision of a timeless moment of fancy, in which "yesterday has already vanished among the shadows of the past" and "to-morrow has not yet emerged from the future." The moment is precarious, however; it must soon yield to the procession of specters out of the dungeons of the haunted mind. Similarly, in "The May-Pole" Poe must have thought he was observing a timeless paradise of imagination in the midst of both the natural wilderness (embodying

time, change, death) and the Puritan society (embodying duty and conscience).⁵ He must have seen that by half-playfully referring to the Merry Mounters as fauns and nymphs of the Golden Age, Hawthorne had gently drawn the tale away from its foundations in the historical Mount Wollaston incident and transformed it into a fable of the “jollity” of art contending against the “gloom” of nature and the moral law. Poe, too, denies his fable a real historical setting and, by naming his protagonist Prospero, recalls Shakespeare’s fabulous artist-magician, whose enchanted island provides a temporary refuge from time and change.⁶

The keynotes of Hawthorne’s Arcadia of art—illusion and sensuousness—also typify the revels of Poe’s Prospero. In “The Haunted Mind,” Hawthorne’s vision is a lotus-land of “pleasant dreams” and “forgetfulness,” and Merry Mount is a “daydream” of endless gaiety, a place of “jest and delusion, trick and fantasy.” If the negative underside of this fantasy-life is a denial of reality, its positive side is the mind’s longing for beauty and joy, for the free play of the imagination and senses. In the “Mask,” as well, the lives of the revelers are “dreams” and “phantasms” willfully called forth in defiance of time and death. But in all three tales reality eventually intrudes. In “The Haunted Mind” pleasant dreams and forgetfulness give way to a “funeral train” and a bloodstained corpse. In “The May-Pole,” as the revelers follow a “flower-decked corpse, with merriment and festive music, to his grave,” Hawthorne queries sardonically, “But did the dead man laugh?” And when the corpselike figure of the Red Death appears among Prospero’s merrymakers, Poe observes that “even with the utterly lost, to whom life and death are equally jests, there *are* matters of which no jest can be properly made.” The acts of the imagination are willed illusions—extravagant jests—which, however beautiful or pleasurable, cannot escape the law of mortality.

In conveying the sensuousness of art—the pure physical enjoyment of the present moment—Poe may have taken a particular hint from “The May-Pole,” for each writer contrasts the spatial image of the spectrum of colors with the temporal progression of nature from youth to maturity to death. In Hawthorne’s tale this timeless art is embodied in the pole itself, symbol of “May, or her mirthful spirit, [which] dwelt all the year round at Merry Mount, sporting with the Summer months, and reveling with Autumn, and basking in the

glow of Winter's fireside." Already the spirit of May is an artifice, an attempt to impose a man-made permanence on the natural progression of the seasons.⁷ The spatial and visual qualities of art are represented by the ribbons at the top of the pole, which are "colored like the rainbow," while the shaft is "stained with the [same] seven brilliant hues." But although the story opens with a clear separation between the colors (emblematic of spatial art) and the seasons (temporal mortality), these images eventually intertwine: "Spring decked the hallowed emblem with the young blossoms and fresh *green* boughs; Summer brought *roses* of the deepest blush, and the perfected foliage of the forest; Autumn enriched it with that *red* and *yellow* gorgeousness which converts each wildwood leaf into a *painted* flower; and Winter *silvered* it with sleet, and hung it round with icicles, till it flashed in the cold sunshine, itself a frozen sunbeam" (italics mine). The frozen sunbeam, like the "frozen dream" in "The Haunted Mind" and the "dreams . . . stiff-frozen" at Prospero's ball, not only prefigures the chill of death but also implies the futility of the artist's longing to freeze time into a moment of stasis.

Poe's blending of spatial color and temporal progression is similar. The "seven brilliant hues" adorning the maypole are paralleled by the seven rooms in which Prospero holds his masquerade, each room of a different color and all of them aligned not in a "long straight vista" but "irregularly," so that "the vision embraced but little more than one at a time." As others have suggested, the succession of rooms and colors implies the successive stages of human life—the traditional seven ages of man—the last chamber being draped in black. But by arranging the rooms so that no one can look backward or forward, the prince has created the spatial illusion of an unchanging present. The illusion is fated to dissipate, however. Just as Hawthorne's seemingly deathless colors finally trace out the progress of the seasons, ending with the icy death of winter, so does the prince at last rush through the seven rooms to his encounter with the Red Death. With no one left alive to observe it, Prospero's brilliant decor remains only an ironic mockery of the quest for permanence.

Finally, all three tales end with the imagery of fading light.⁸ As the "black shadows" of the Puritans overwhelmed the maypole revelers, "the evening sky grew darker, and the woods threw forth a more sombre shadow." In "The Haunted Mind," the "nightmare

of the soul" is fitfully illuminated by "the slumbering embers on the hearth," but "soon the flame vanishes, and with it the whole scene is gone, though its image remains an instant in your mind's eye, when darkness has swallowed the reality." At Prince Prospero's revel "the flames of the tripods expired. And Darkness and Decay and the Red Death held illimitable dominion over all."

These parallel images of fading light, however, can be misleading, for the endings of Hawthorne's tales are less gloomy than the memorable last paragraph of the "Mask." Although Poe could accept the impermanence of art and life, Hawthorne could not. Instead, he sought an alternative vision. In "The Haunted Mind," when the frozen dream of an artist's fancy succumbs to the procession of specters, Hawthorne reflects longingly "how pleasant, in these night solitudes, would be the rise and fall of a softer breathing than your own, the slight pressure of a tenderer bosom, the quiet throb of a purer heart, imparting its peacefulness to your troubled one, as if the fond sleeper were involving you in her dream." In "The May-Pole," as well, the gaiety of the revelers gives way not to the stark alternative of the Puritan whipping-post but to a less disquieting dream: the gentle "heavenward" progress of Edith and Edgar, who, in their new-found bliss, never waste "one regretful thought on the vanities of Merry Mount."

Not all the elements of Hawthorne's two tales, therefore, were of equal interest to Poe. For Hawthorne, domestic bliss provides a buffer between the illusions of art and the ravages of time. In "The Mask of the Red Death," on the other hand, there is no such mitigation. To Poe, the momentary pageant of art remains the sole barrier against Darkness and Decay and the Red Death, whose ultimate triumph cannot be stayed.

NOTES

1. Robert Regan, "Hawthorne's 'Plagiary': Poe's Duplicity," *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, 25 (1970-71), 281-298. In this article Regan is not looking for sources or influences in the usual sense but is instead trying to show that Poe was engaged in an ingenious form of "duplicity" in which, by falsely charging Hawthorne with plagiarizing from "William Wilson" in "Legends of the Province House," he was slyly directing attention to his own use of the "Legends" in "The Mask

of the Red Death." But as intriguing as Regan's argument is, I suspect that Poe's attitude toward Hawthorne was less playful. One can easily agree with Regan that Poe's old bugaboo of plagiarism is not the word for the relationship between these two writers. Nor is it necessarily true that Poe consciously found in Hawthorne's tales a "source" of the kind other scholars have pointed out, with varying degrees of plausibility, in a number of other literary works. Instead, this would seem a more ordinary case of literary influence—a matter, as Melville expressed it, of one writer's dropping "germinous seeds" into the creative imagination of another. In any case, Poe was certainly reading *Twice-Told Tales* at the time he was writing the "Mask," for both the review and the tale appear in the May 1842 issue of *Graham's*.

2. Quotations from "The May-Pole of Merry Mount" and "The Haunted Mind" are from *Twice-Told Tales* (Boston: James Monroe and Co., 1842), I, 65-83, and II, 91-99. Quotations from "The Mask of the Red Death: a Fantasy" (in later publications "Mask" became "Masque" and the subtitle was omitted) are from *Graham's Magazine*, 20 (1842), 257-259. I am grateful to Benjamin F. Fisher IV, for checking the editions of *Twice-Told Tales* and *Graham's Magazine* in the University of Pennsylvania Library.
3. Regan notes that such a clock-chime occurs also in "Legends of the Province House" ("Hawthorne's 'Plagiary,'" p. 290).
4. Regan also observes several striking parallels between Prospero's confrontation with the Red Death and Sir William Howe's encounter with the muffled intruder in "Howe's Masquerade" ("Hawthorne's 'Plagiary,'" pp. 285, 288).
5. The only critic to recognize the theme of art in "The May-Pole of Merry Mount" is Daniel Hoffman, *Form and Fable in American Fiction* (New York, 1961), pp. 146-148. Though the life of art is not the only theme of the tale, it is the one to which Poe would have been most fully attuned.
6. For an illuminating discussion of "The Mask of the Red Death" as a tale primarily concerned with an effort to create a paradise of art, see Kermit Vanderbilt, "Art and Nature in 'The Masque of the Red Death,'" *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, 22 (1967-68), 379-389. This article also explores the parallels to *The Tempest*.
7. Critics occasionally suggest that the Merry Mounters are in harmony with nature. But in this tale nature is associated repeatedly with the movement of the seasons—that is, with time. The Merry Mounters, on the other hand, attempt to *halt* time, to achieve an artificial moment of timelessness, to cause May to remain "all the year round."
8. Regan finds similar images of fading light in "Legends of the Province House" ("Hawthorne's 'Plagiary,'" pp. 290-291).

William Carlos Williams's *Paterson*: a Search for Language, a Recovery of Words

JAMES DEMUTH*

THE epic appeals strongly to American poets. One thinks immediately of Walt Whitman and Hart Crane, as well as such minor figures as Philip Freneau and Stephen Vincent Benét. The size of our country, diversity of our people, and wealth of our resources all demand epic comprehension. More importantly, our history of nation building, by turns inspiring and distressing, has been a theme of intense moral interest. It is this moral concern which William Carlos Williams dramatizes in his epic *Paterson*, a poem originally conceived in four books but later extended to five.

Williams immediately alerts his reader to the epic character of *Paterson* by calling his first book "The Delineaments of the Giants." However, unlike Walt Whitman, whose influence he repeatedly acknowledges, Williams does not style his "Giants" as the democratic people "en-masse." With Williams, the "Giants" stand for the large figures of Paterson's landscape (the city and Garret Mountain) whose potential for beauty and inspiration (embodied in the Passaic Falls, the natural wonder of the place) has been defiled by the citizens. Instead of singing the optimistic epic of the making of democratic men in our history, Williams tells the grim story of an American "Waste Land":

. . . a thousand automatons. Who because they
neither know their sources nor the sills of their
disappointments walk outside their bodies aimlessly
for the most part,
locked and forgot in their desires—unroused. (p. 14)¹

If the first four books of *Paterson* are epic in scope, they are decidedly anti-epic in content; they are the unremittingly pathetic record of men sometimes willfully, more often indifferently, debasing their environment and their community.

* Assistant Professor of English, University of Wisconsin-River Falls.

Whereas *Paterson I-IV* is a severe indictment of Americans who in the course of their history have lost and show little interest in recovering an authentic language of cultural and spiritual integrity, *Paterson V* is a more modest, temperate, and contemplative poem. The later poem, though differing in tone, composition, and rhetoric from the earlier books, successfully culminates them by reclaiming their seemingly hopeless theme—the possibility of authentic language. Williams reconsiders in *Paterson V* the varieties of American idiomatic speech he had impugned in *Paterson I-IV* to demonstrate in his new verse their genuine, if limited, aesthetic capacity in “A WORLD OF ART / THAT THROUGH THE YEARS HAS / SURVIVED!” (p. 244).

In *Paterson I-IV*, Williams had sought the language which would heal the divorce of the contemporary Patersonite from his experience, environment, and history: “Life is sweet / they say: the language! / —the language / is divorced from their minds, / the language . . the language!” (p. 21). This language, though ill-defined and elusive in the four books of the poem, evokes the constellation of meanings Williams more commonly denoted by the term *contact*. As Williams defines the term in various essays written before and after *Paterson*, *contact* means the direct, sensual apprehension of reality² and the imaginative comprehension of this experience in native arts—whether poetry, painting, or folk crafts—undistorted by the “false language” of derivative customs, fashions, and ideologies.³ The redemptive language sought in *Paterson I-IV* would be, considering the range of Williams’s materials, the idiomatic speech and vernacular literature, as well as material arts and cultural rituals, expressing authentic contact; the irony undercutting the imperative search is that the language is sought among a people who, by their urban history, secular materialism, and industrial labor, have become alienated from their environment, ignorant of their aborted community traditions, and dulled in their curiosity and imagination.

That the search for a language of authentic contact should be the theme of William’s American epic is understandable in light of our history of literary and linguistic nationalism. From its patriotic origins in Philip Freneau, Noah Webster, and William Cullen Bryant, through its more complete and conscious development in Longfellow, Whitman, and Twain, American literary nationalism has

affirmed, in Emerson's touchstone phrase, the democratic language of "the near, the low, the common."⁴ Often considering their environment to have meager historic and romantic associations, several nineteenth-century American writers compensated for this poverty by asserting, few with more spirit than Henry David Thoreau, the artistic imperative of experiencing and comprehending nature through direct contact:

... daily to be shown matter, to come in contact with it,—rocks, trees, wind on our cheeks! the *solid* earth! the *actual* world! the *common sense!* *Contact! Contact!*⁵

In his art and criticism, William Carlos Williams reaffirms this democratic and sensual aesthetics of American literary nationalism; often, in commenting upon nineteenth-century American literary figures, Williams would isolate for emphasis those instances of contact with the actual world and the common sense that he found. Thus he celebrates Noah Webster's "radically subversive thesis"⁶ that common, native usage could determine the national idiom, and he announces a "shocking truth" in the implication that *Leaves of Grass* means that "the common ground is of itself a poetic source."⁷

In approving the instances of authentic contact which he finds in American writers, Williams often defines their accomplishment in nationalistic terms. Edgar Allan Poe, for example, is esteemed because it "is the New World, or to leave that for the better term, it is a *new locality* that is in Poe assertive; it is America, the first great burst through to expression of a re-awakened genius of *place*."⁸ To Williams, contact with the New World or divorce from it was the persistent drama of American history, weakening over time as the country became more urbanized. Williams's thesis of American historical experience, informing *Paterson I-IV* and governing Williams's selection of incidents from Paterson's local history, is that the dominant, urban culture (embodied in the figure of Alexander Hamilton in *Paterson I-IV*) is the "unrelated, borrowed, the would-be universal culture," while the "culture of immediacy" had only been accomplished by eccentric individuals (Sam Patch, for example)⁹ or small, isolated communities (the colonial Paterson village) which "made contact with the intrinsic elements of an as yet unrealized material of which the new country was made."¹⁰

The severe contrast Williams draws between the “culture of immediacy” and the “unrelated, borrowed” urban culture is the rhetorical design of *Paterson I-IV*, defining the “divorce” which the “language” of democratic conviction and sensual contact might resolve; in presenting Paterson as a synecdoche of American historical experience,¹¹ Williams repeatedly juxtaposes in ironic contrast an expression of the unified life in a primary culture (principally, Totawa and Mezo-American Indian cultures, African tribal culture, colonial Paterson culture) with a related expression of the debased life in industrialized Paterson.¹² With a few exceptions in *Paterson IV* that I will discuss, Williams characterizes the difference between the city and the rural or primitive cultures as an absolute difference in expression; the Patersonite either speaks a vulgar and mean-spirited idiom or gushes foolish sentiments, while the primitive contrasted with him expresses the spirit of his common life in candid and devout art.

In Williams's usual portrait, the primitive exemplifies a life of “contact with the intrinsic elements” by patterning his imagination of the timeless and mythic in rituals of “the near, the low, the common.” Thus, where the sentimental Mrs. Cumming, lacking the words and art to comprehend her sensual experience, stumbles over the Passaic Falls under the narcotic influence of the “beautiful, wild and romantic scenery,” the nine African women in a *National Geographic* picture use the most common natural materials (“log,” “mud-caked”) to symbolize their sexual roles as the chief’s consorts (pp. 22-24). Similarly, Ibidio women bury a fallen warrior on a bed of fresh leaves and, waving the bough from a sacred tree over his genitals, preserve his sexual vigor for the tribe’s continued fertility. By contrast, the pathetic invalid Clifford keeps his sexuality by writing his friends “to send him some dirty jokes because he can’t get out to hear them himself” (pp. 171-172).

It is not necessary, though, to go as far afield as Africa to find rituals of primitive cultures contrasted with the spiritually barren “false language” of Paterson. “Indians!” (p. 29). The American Indian is always in the background of *Paterson* and is a memory Patersonites wish to exorcise: “Forget it! for God’s sake, Cut / out that stuff” (p. 68). Indian culture is most prominently featured in Book III in three incidents from Totawa life. Aesthetics, the creation and

comprehension of beauty, is the principal theme of Book III, and the Totawa are presented as men who artistically fashioned their whole lives. In the first incident, for example, the Indians are sadistically mutilated by Dutch soldiers, and one of the victims asks his tormentors "to permit him to dance the Kinte Kaye, a religious use among them before death" (p. 125). Not only in these terrible moments of crisis, however, did the Indian find solace in artistic ritual. Everything in his life is touched by beauty: "They made money of sea-shells. Bird feathers. Beaver skins" (p. 125). The Dutch, however, imagined only the commercial exploitation of Indian culture: they dug up the grave of an Indian priest, stole the funeral furs, and left the carcass to the wolves.

Williams's affirmative depictions of "primary" cultures contrast sharply with his portraits of Patersonites as heirs of a "secondary" urban culture; whereas Williams consistently represents the primitive living in a richly integrated culture, he uniformly depicts Patersonites, through his selection of newspaper clippings, letters, and odd bits of historical record, as people who have debased their cultural language through their avarice, violence, and gross materialism. Thus, in the beginning of *Paterson I*, after introducing the primordial union of Paterson and Garret Mountain, and after describing Garret Mountain's power to waken the dreams of the people ("Pearls at her ankles, her monstrous hair / spangled with apple-blossoms is scattered about into / the back country, waking their dreams" (p. 17), Williams dramatically shows the avaricious turn their dreams took in 1857. In that year, David Howe discovered the "Queen Pearl" in a lot of mussels collected at Notch Brook. This discovery incited a wanton destruction of millions of mussels. In plundering Garret Mountain ("Pearls at her ankles"), Patersonites destroyed what they would possess: "A large round pearl, weighing 400 grains which would have been the finest pearl of modern times, was ruined by boiling open the shell" (p. 17).

Williams selects many similar scenes of defilement from Paterson's history: boys stone a huge striped bass and are commended by the *Bergen Express* and the *Paterson Advertiser*; men slaughter eels in a drained lake on the upper Passaic; police officers delight in harrying a mink through town. In Book II, the "great beast" of picnickers exhibit this callousness toward nature as an ingrained attitude. And

this attitude is not a local prejudice: Paterson is the symbol of all American cities. Thus in Book iv, Williams startles us with the recognition that American cities have exhausted the sources for pastoral imagination by retelling the classical tale of Corydon and Phyllis as an unconsummated lesbian seduction in Manhattan. Corydon, the businesswoman, poetess, and lesbian of this ironic idyll, expresses the sterility of her passions in dispiriting landscape imagery. She ruefully notes that three bald rocks are “all that’s left of the elemental, the primitive” in the East River. Though she gamely attempts a “pastoral” with this meager primitive (“I call them my sheep,” says Corydon. “They’re white all right but it’s from the gulls that crap them up all day long,” notes Phyllis), her poem only achieves coherence and power in the section where she describes Manhattan commerce as mechanized sexual intercourse (pp. 195–196). Corydon senses the ruined cityscape, but she can no longer express the landscape; for her, Anticosti is simply an exotic prop for the champagne cruise seduction of Phyllis.

Paralleling Paterson’s abuse of its environment is Williams’s other theme of criminal destruction, the rapid and tragically irreversible dissolution of community. In Williams’s grim picture of Paterson’s hobbled community, even the family is dissolved. “T,” for instance, writes of his macabre visit home to his ailing mother and his sister Billy. The family is convulsed in petty jealousies masking very deep hatreds which suddenly erupt when Billy attacks “T” with a poker and is threatened with death if she strikes. There are similar incidents. Fred Goodell kills his six-month-old-daughter. Phyllis fends off her alcoholic father’s incestuous attacks.

All human relations are poisoned in this befouled community. As the “Giants” delineated in Book i (Paterson and Garret Mountain) are figures of an ideal union, so the real anarchy of urban Paterson is mirrored in the fractured, squalid sexuality of its citizens. Sex is either assault (“senseless rapes—caught on hands and knees / scrubbing a greasy corridor” (p. 51); or the dumb lethargy of the lovers in section one, Book ii—“wounded (drunk), moves / against him (a lump) desiring, / against him, bored” (p. 75). The poet is not exempt. The personal letters Williams reprints, save the somewhat fawning epistles from Allen Ginsberg, are all carping, bitter accusations of, ironically, Williams’s haughty indifference to the real life of Paterson:

“. . . writers like yourself who are so sheltered from life in the raw by the glass-walled conditions of their own safe lives,” hisses the spurned poetess-lover “C” in Book II. Not the giants’ marriage but “Divorce is / the sign of knowledge in our time, / divorce! divorce!” (p. 28).

For Williams, the major symptom of Paterson’s divorce is the “false language” which the poet vainly tries to redeem. As a slight example of the ignorance and cultural envy revealed in our characteristic language choices, Williams had cited, in “The American Background,” our misnaming of the native redbreasted thrush as robin, that “rosy, daintier English bird.”¹³ He again alludes to this example in *Paterson I* when, in one of the laments marking his search for a redeeming language (“Stale as a whale’s breath: breath!”), he invokes the forsaken bird:

Clearly!
speaks the red-breast his behest. Clearly!
clearly! (p. 31)

The red-breast’s clear behest is not simply for a distinctive vocabulary but, as Williams’s portraits of primitive cultures indicate, for an entire language of ritual. However, throughout *Paterson I-IV* Williams repeatedly shows the Patersonites’ inability to achieve authentic expression. For example, in *Paterson III*, he associates the dead dog floating in the Passaic flood with Cerberus and then, characteristically sharply juxtaposes a citizen’s plaintive cry, “Come yeah, Chi Chi!” (p. 159). Immune to any transcendent meaning to reality, Patersonites cherish their petty grievances: “That was your little dog bit me last year.” By contrast Wyandach, brother of the slain Pogatticut, killed Pogatticut’s favorite dog and “after painting his muzzle red” laid him in the dead warrior’s grave (pp. 157-158).

In the final section of *Paterson IV*, though, Williams’s scathing indictment of Patersonites softens. His tone, there, is often solicitously personal: “Virtue, / my kitten, is a complex reward in all / languages, achieved slowly” (p. 220). And some citizens now achieve the language of virtue. Williams’s friend, the hotel manager, quite innocently sleeps with the naked girl he finds in his room; at a funeral, Williams remembers the dead woman generously and sympathetically. *Paterson* here touches on the character of tragedy; not

“automatons” nor the “great beast” but live, complex individuals are borne on the forces debasing the city.

The tragedy of Paterson’s debasement is reinforced by Williams’s long pastoral on colonial and early national Paterson (Book IV, section 3). Its settlers casually and gracefully unite native products with European: “Rude furniture, sanded floors, rush / bottomed chair, a pewter shelf of Britannia [sic] / ware.” They produce native artists (“a drawing / made by Lieut. Gov. Pownall [excellent work]”), ceremoniously welcome the returning Lafayette and, in their “antiquated” circus, create public entertainment perfectly proportioned to the community. They have, in short, everything that the “debased city” lacks: work is a robust activity, the business center is “the prettiest spot in town”; Fyfield’s tavern is idyllically set amid delicate ponds where birds sport (pp. 227–232).

Though the sentimental quaintness with which Williams embroiders his memory of the early Paterson lessens the effect of tragic loss in its post–Alexander Hamilton susceptibility to a “false language,” still the loss is real. As he had argued in “The American Background,” the small American community “was the culture of immediacy, the active strain, which has left every relic of value which survives to-day.”¹⁴ So, in *Paterson IV*, Allen Ginsberg discovers the enduring Paterson in the area around Mill and River streets where faint relics of the lost Paterson survive. This ghost of Paterson past is not enough, though, to regenerate the present. Williams ends the poem utterly alone shouting defiance at the “hungry sea.” When the man and his dog appear as another living “relic of value” of rural Paterson, the memory of John Johnson’s execution intervenes with all its connotations of Paterson’s dismal urban history, and Williams seals his poem:

This is the blast
the eternal close
the spiral
the final somersault
the end. (p. 238)

Paterson IV ends on the rhetorical note which has sounded throughout the long poem, the ironic contrast between an image of easy, unmediated contact with “the near, the low, the common”—a man rises from the sea, sleeps on shore, dresses, and heads inland with his

dog after first sampling some beach plums from a low bush—and a blunt reminder in the newspaper notice of John Johnson's hanging in April 1850 (avidly witnessed by thousands, some from rooftops) of the criminality and prurient interest in criminality degrading Paterson's history. Aptly, Williams names his conclusion "the final somersault," an image which captures the poem's rapidly turning upside-down movement through repeated ironic contrasts of primary or "contact" cultures and secondary or "divorce" cultures.

The "final somersault," though, is not the complete summary image: Williams concludes with a seemingly disjointed visual image of the poem as both a spiral and a somersault. While "somersault" points to the poem's rhetorical technique of ironic contrast, dramatizing the "divorce" which the language sought is to mend, "spiral" is an appropriate image of the poem's orderly descent through distinct levels of experience in the search for that language.¹⁵ In each book, the "Giants," Noah Faitoute Paterson, and his consort, Garret Mountain, descend through metamorphic changes on successively lower levels of experience to reenact the previous book's dramatic quest for a redemptive language.

Book I introduces Paterson as the elemental "Giant" drawing life from the awesome Passaic Falls to sustain the parasitic "automatons" of the modern city. Book II finds Paterson as a man, yet distinct from other men. Here he is a prophetic figure wandering alone through the Sunday picnic crowd straining "to catch the movement of one voice" (p. 76) that will redeem the day. In Book III Paterson is the persona of Williams (in the first two books, Williams's explicit voice is distinct from the character of Paterson). Here Paterson-Williams is a poet researching in the library and a doctor ministering to the scarred, beaten Negro woman in the basement. Though Paterson remains "I" in section 1 of Book IV, he is more deeply implicated in the degraded life of his city than in previous books. Instead of being very distanced from the common Patersonite by his professional callings of poetry and medicine, he is introduced as simply a "married man" pursuing but never consummating an illicit affair with Phyllis, a backwoods girl on the make in New York City as masseuse for the wealthy lesbian Corydon.

The career of Garret Mountain corresponds to the declining station of her lover. In Book I, Garret Mountain is an inexhaustibly fertile

beauty calmly reposing in Paterson's embrace. By Book II, Garret Mountain is simply an urban park. Instead of "farms and ponds," she is now burdened with refreshment stands and toilets. The "automatons" of Book I have ominously grown to the "great beast" and now obstruct the "ceremonial of love" between Paterson and Garret Mountain.

In Book III, Paterson's consort assumes human form as the sick, abused woman in the basement who embodies, in Paterson's intense longing, the "Beautiful Thing." This phrase incarnated Williams's reverence for the beauty and wildness awaiting contact in the New World; it is the phrase of wonder taken from Columbus's diary of October 13, 1492: "I walked among the trees which was the most beautiful thing which I had ever seen."¹⁶ By embodying the "Beautiful Thing," the woman in the basement symbolizes the potential for a language of contact; yet, significantly and revealing for the poem's theme of divorce, she is unconscious of all that her marred beauty represents; she has wasted her beauty on a three-day drunk, ending, Williams strongly implies, in gang rape. Before her dumb pain, Doctor Paterson weeps.

In Book IV, the bond between Paterson and his love is further weakened; as they become more human, their love debases. Whereas Doctor Paterson was emotionally overcome before the nude "Beautiful Thing," the Paterson of Book IV sees only a naked woman in Phyllis, and his vision is described in terms which obviously parody the previous exalted experience:

He drew back the white
shirt . slid aside the
ribbons .

Glory be to God .
—then stripped her
and all His Saints!

No, just broad shouldered (p. 184)

While the metamorphic changes of Paterson and his consort define the levels of experience through which the poet seeks the redemptive language, and while their decline to illicit, unconsummated lovers makes more extreme the "divorce" which the language might re-

solve, the spiral character of the poet's search is signalled in a characteristic scene in the final section of each book. In these scenes, just as the poet's search for a redemptive language seems to reach a despairing end, he finds, unexpectedly, a "new awakening" which turns the quest back on itself:

Faitoute ground his heel
hard down on the stone:

Sunny today, with the highest temperature near 80 degrees; moderate southerly winds. Partly cloudy and continued warm tomorrow, with moderate southerly winds.

Her belly . . . her belly is like
a cloud . . . a cloud
at evening . . .
His mind would reawaken: (p. 104)

Just as the weather report here suggests a simile to reawaken N. F. Paterson's mind, so in Book I the squalid tenements reveal "a tranquility and loveliness," in Book III the memory of "La capella di S. Rocco" arrests Paterson's lament, and, in Book IV, a swimmer emerges from the "blood dark sea" into which the Passaic, a symbol of the whole poem, is dissolving.

The "new awakening" of one book's conclusion, though, is frustrated in the "despairs" that make up the following, and Book IV ends with no gain or hope. That the "spiral" of the descent through the levels of *Paterson I-IV* should only issue the "final somersault" of ironically opposed images has been conditioned by Williams's narrow selection of incidents from the city's history; the language the poet seeks, we imagine, could resolve the conflict between primitive and urban, ceremonial and debased which has been the drama of Paterson, but Williams's selection from Paterson's history seals this possibility of redemptive language. The city's language defies the poet's search for the "gist" of a language of authentic contact because it expresses, in the newspaper clippings, personal letters, and historical incidents Williams selects, not the Patersonites' consciousness of place but only callous waste and criminal defilement.

Though *Paterson IV* announced a definite end, it remained unsettled in Williams's mind and was succeeded, seven years later, by *Paterson V*. In many ways, Williams isolates *Paterson V*. Instead of

episodes from the city's local history, Williams selects images from "A WORLD OF ART / THAT THROUGH THE YEARS HAS / SURVIVED!" (p. 244). Except in Ezra Pound's comically paranoid letter (pp. 254-255), the political and economic themes of the earlier books are largely abandoned for "the museum." Where Williams's correspondents in Books I-IV were involved, if not locked, in the city, now many seem to be deserting Paterson: Josie writes from her very pleasant rural estate; Allen Ginsberg announces his plans to leave on a ship for an Arctic cruise; Edward is content in Spain. The only remaining Patersonite, other than the poet, is the indifferent woman "in worn slacks" ironically invoked as Williams's muse.

Paterson V's greatest distinction, though, is its freedom from the self-conscious anxiety about an authentic, honest language so evident in the earlier books. The only place this theme appears in *Paterson V* is in the reprinted transcript of the television interview of Williams by Mike Wallace. Here one senses Williams mocking his own pretensions of capturing the "American idiom" in a poem unintelligible to the bewildered Mr. Wallace and then being confronted by Wallace with a poem by e. e. cummings that is unintelligible to both of them. In any event, the problem Williams discusses is not the creation of a new language but the poetic clarification of the rhythm of our present language.

Instead of searching for a language to redeem our debased tongue, the elusive goal of the poet's quest throughout *Paterson I-IV*, Williams now persistently confronts the challenge of making art from our "shoddy" times. Where Book IV ended with a man and his dog, symbols reminiscent of the simple life in a long-lost Paterson village, Book V concludes in the immediate present with Williams confronting his cantankerous grandmother. Williams's choice of his grandmother is significant; now he is personally bound in the present and cannot so easily yield to the anguished rhetoric about the "blood dark sea" and "debased city" that marked the earlier books. Whereas Williams's nostalgic image of the swimmer in *Paterson IV*, following upon his long pastoral of colonial Paterson, had denied the modern and urban, now he wrings poetry from the modern tongue:

She did not want to live to be
an old woman to wear a china doorknob
in her vagina to hold her womb up—but

she came to that, resourceful, what?
He was the first to turn her up
and never left her till he left her
with child, as any soldier would
until the camp broke up. (p. 277)

Language is not now the burden of “false language” but a poetic resource. The Unicorn tapestry aptly symbolizes Williams’s successful effort in *Paterson V* to weld the local and the mythic, a feat only primitives could do in *Paterson I-IV*. While the foreign is remote and idealized in *Paterson I-IV*, now Brueghel and the Flemish tapestry are immediately present and can be apprehended in modern idiom:

The expression of her face,
 where she stands removed from the others
—the virgin and the whore,
 an identity,
 both for sale
to the highest bidder! (p. 276)

Furthermore, Williams drops the solemn tone he so often adopted in *Paterson I-IV* when depicting a past or distant “primary culture” and now even banters the foreign emissaries. For example, before cataloguing all the flowers in the Unicorn tapestry, Williams consoles his poet-hero:

Paterson,
keep your pecker up
whatever the detail! (p. 273)

This, just after Paterson had been grandly styled “I, Paterson, the King-self.”

The difference in idiom between *Paterson I-IV* and *Paterson V* is revealing. In the earlier poem, Williams emphatically and frequently used idiomatic speech as a sign of the debased language. Now he forsakes his quest for the Grail of a phantom language and, instead, presents himself as simply a craftsman “trying / to get the young / to foreshorten / their errors in the use of words which / he had found so difficult” (p. 268). Instead of a descent to despair, the poet-craftsman of *Paterson V* ends with a modest victory:

We know nothing and can know nothing . . .
but
the dance, to dance to a measure
contrapuntally,
Satyrically, the tragic foot. (p. 278)

Just as the “spiral” and “somersault” of *Paterson IV* had summarized the character of its drama and poetry, so in *Paterson V*’s conclusion, “contrapuntally” identifies the dynamic union of opposites (satyr-tragedy, virgin-whore) which is the poem’s pervading theme. In *Paterson V* Williams welds refined and vulgar idioms, exalted and gross experiences to evoke an elusive “identity” in their contrapuntal play:

The whore and the virgin, an identity:
—through its disguises
thrash about—but will not succeed in breaking free :
an identity (p. 245)

In Williams’s range over “THE WORLD OF ART,” we find, through his sensibility, this identity thrashing about in the tension between the divine and the adulterous in Peter Brueghel’s *Nativity*, between love and promiscuity in Lorca’s *The Love of Don Perlimplin*, and, most fully, in the play between the sensual and the carnal in the Unicorn tapestries.

Not only in its tense, evocative imagery is *Paterson V* distinguished, but also in its poetic measure, a more subtle and confident poetics than the awkward dependence on ironic contrasts in *Paterson I-IV*. The “dance to a measure” which Williams achieves in *Paterson V* is, in his terms, the “variable foot” meter. Each line is a discrete “foot” and, though lines vary in syllable-length, all lines have the same time-duration. The pattern of syllabic accents is based on the ordinary rhythm of phrase and rhetorical stresses; it is a “talking” poetry. As such, this represents little change in Williams’s art; from the beginning he had structured his poems on the rhythm of simple declarative sentences. The only real departure from this method is *Paterson I-IV*, and that poem’s coherence suffers from its lack of recurrent meter.

Because *Paterson V* has a basic rhythm, Williams can vary the measure in different parts of the poem without the whole poem fracturing. While *Paterson I-IV* is frequently a shattered poem of

short, varied clusters of verse interspersed with prose, *Paterson V* is built of longer units of poetry and prose, each with a distinct voice, yet all speaking a common tongue. Williams's furthest departure from variable-foot blank verse in *Paterson V* is his translation of Sappho in section 2. Here Williams uses anapestic trimeter quatrains, each stanza, however, concluding with a line of one foot. Though regular, the meter of Williams's translation is subtly varied by his shortening of several anapests, by his alliteration of consonantal clusters, and by his skillful continuation of some poetic feet from the end of one line into the opening syllable or syllables of the succeeding line ("to your sweet speech and love ly / laugh ter"). Knit as it is with alliteration and internal assonance, the poem evokes musical rhythm, as befits a rendition of Sappho's unique "clear gentle tinkling voice" (p. 253). In contrast to the despair over worn-out language in Books I-IV, Williams here demonstrates the lyric potential of American language. However, Williams subtly makes another point. Where the despairing poet of *Paterson III* pitifully laments his inability "to find one phrase that will / lie married beside another for delight" (p. 167), Williams now quietly implies much the same thing by limiting his delightful American verse to his translation of Greek.

This point is underscored by the following unit of poetry in which the "woman in our town / walks rapidly, flat belled / in worn slacks" (pp. 255-257). These stanzas in a wholly American idiom about an American subject are deliberately prosaic with no hint of the delightful artifices of Williams's translation of Sappho. There is no discernible accentual pattern, and the only rhythm seems to be the normal breath rhythm of speech; it is variable-foot verse with the least variety. Only occasionally does Williams "poeticize" his verse by isolating one word, thus forcing pause to what is otherwise a reading of prose. Again, this technique shows Williams's increased subtlety in *Paterson V*. Whereas he castigated our "tongue-tied" language in *Paterson II*, now by the occasionally isolated words of this verse he simply demonstrates the awkward, halting character of our speech.

Though the "WORLD OF ART" emblazoned on the opening pages of *Paterson V* seems to seal the world of Paterson, I think Williams achieved a truer image of the city in this "museum" than in the mausoleum of the "automatons'" local history. *Paterson I-IV* is

laden with history but reads as fantasy. Williams too easily and frequently lapses into simple contrasts of the sacred primitives and the "debased city." Assuming that the "raw new" is destroyed ("You come today to see killed / killed, killed," p. 233), the poet finds little to create in the present; the Passaic Falls, Williams's symbol of the uninterpreted "raw new" in *Paterson*, begins and ends simply a roar. In *Paterson V* Williams sets aside the futile quest of the earlier books. He accepts (humbly, as his self-image of the poet-craftsman indicates) the "American idiom" as an authentic cultural expression and probes its structure. By this acceptance, Williams opens the real world of *Paterson*.

NOTES

1. All citations for *Paterson* refer to the 1963 edition, New Directions Paperbook.
2. When defining *contact*, Williams would frequently employ the vocabulary of a strict empiricism to distinguish his aesthetics from what he considered to be the excessive subjectivity of nineteenth-century romanticism: "The artist is limited to the range of his contact with the objective world. . . . it is inconceivable that, no matter how circuitously, contact with an immediate objective world of actual experience has not been rigorously maintained. By 'artist' is meant nearly this thing alone." William Carlos Williams, "Yours, O Youth," *Contact, Number 3* (New York: Kraus Reprint, 1967), p. 14. Much of Williams's poetry prior to *Paterson* exemplifies this empiricist aesthetics; as J. Hillis Miller noted in explaining "Young Sycamore," we do not experience that poem as a symbolic picture of a tree but empirically as "an activity . . . a dynamic thing, primarily verbal." "[It] has the same kind of life as the tree." J. Hillis Miller, introduction to *William Carlos Williams: a Collection of Critical Essays* (Englewood Cliffs, 1966), pp. 10 and 12.
3. "What I put down of value," Williams asserts in *Spring and All*, "will have this value: an escape from crude symbolism, the annihilation of strained associations, complicated ritualistic forms designed to separate the work from 'reality.'" Williams, *Imaginations* (New York, 1971), p. 102. As examples of native American art freed from "crude symbolism" Williams especially admired the untutored painting of American primitives, the material arts of the Shakers, the photography and painting of Charles Sheeler, and the poetry of Marianne Moore and Gertrude Stein. See especially his critical essays "Marianne Moore" (1925) and "The Work of Gertrude Stein" (1930) in *Imaginations*; and "Introduction to Charles Sheeler" (1939) and "Painting in the American Grain" (1954) in *Selected Essays*.
4. Ralph Waldo Emerson, "The American Scholar," *The American Literary Revolution, 1783-1837*, ed. Robert E. Spiller (New York, 1967), p. 451.

5. Henry David Thoreau, *The Maine Woods* (New York, 1961), p. 93.
6. Williams, "The American Background," *Selected Essays* (New York, 1969), p. 136.
7. Williams, "An Essay on *Leaves of Grass*," *Leaves of Grass: One Hundred Years After*, ed. Milton Hindus (Stanford, 1955), p. 22.
8. Williams, *In the American Grain* (New York, 1956), p. 216.
9. As an heroic figure of contact, Sam Patch resembles Boone, Crockett, and Houston ("The American Background," *Selected Essays*). Like the others, he is admired for his technical skill and daring execution, but he remains inarticulate about his motives. When Patch makes his first, impulsive dive, he speaks concretely and idiomatically (culture of immediacy): "Now, old Tim Crane thinks he has done something great; but I can beat him." Before his last and fatal leap, he attempts a speech (unrelated culture), and Williams interprets his death as his failure of language: "A speech! What could he say that he must leap so desperately to complete it? . . . instead of descending with a plummet-like fall his body wavered in the air—Speech had failed him. He was confused. The word had been drained of its meaning" (p. 27).
10. The quoted phrases come from Williams's essay "The American Background" (1934), his most concise and explicit exposition of his interpretation of American history as "the persistent struggle between the raw new and the graciousness of an imposed cultural design." An earlier exploration of this "struggle" was the series of biographical essays *In the American Grain* (1925).
11. A concise explanation of Paterson's local history as a syncdoche of the nation's history can be found in Benjamin Sankey's *A Companion to William Carlos Williams's Paterson* (Berkeley, 1971), p. 10.
12. As Charles L. Sanford has noted, the rhetorical technique of ironic juxtaposition is common in twentieth-century English and American poetry. He points out, for example, that Eliot's *The Waste Land* places "isolated fragments of sordid contemporary experience in ironic juxtaposition to both the romantic images of an earlier age and the symbols of a restorative tradition found in primitive myth and ritual." Charles L. Sanford, *The Quest for Paradise: Europe and the American Moral Imagination* (Urbana, 1961), p. 21. It is revealing to notice that Williams, for all of his intended distinction from Eliot, employs the rhetoric of *The Waste Land* in *Paterson I-IV*.
13. Williams, "The American Background," p. 134.
14. Ibid., p. 148.
15. A good summary of the various orders (temporal, spatial, imagistic) which have been discerned in the arrangement of the first four books of *Paterson* can be found in Joel Conarroe's *William Carlos Williams' Paterson: Language and Landscape* (Philadelphia, 1970), particularly in pages 10-24, 85, 109-115. I disagree with Conarroe's identification of "air" as the dominant element in Book IV; the highlight of that book—Madame Curie's discovery of the "radian gist"—is described sexually.
16. Williams, *In the American Grain*, p. 26.

